THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

Papers.

GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

University of London

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

620062

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

32° & 33° VICTORIÆ, 1868-9.

VOL. CXCVIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JULY 1869,

TO

THE ELEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST 1869.

Fifth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
23, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1869

Irish Church Bill—
Returned from the Commons with several of the amendments made by the Lords *agreed to;* several amendments *agreed to*, with amendments; and several other amendments *disagreed to*, for which they assign Reasons:—The said Reasons, and Bill, with the amendments, to be *printed;* and to be taken into consideration on *Tuesday* next. (Nos. 196 and 197)

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 16.

Turkey—Christians in Crete—Question, Mr. Serjeant Dowse; Answer, Mr. Otway 19
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery—Question, Mr. H. A. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Layard 20
Irish Church Bill [Bill 209]—
Lords' Amendments *further considered* 21
Clause 29 (Enactments with respect to private endowments).
Division List, Ayes and Noes 47
Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus).
Division List, Ayes and Noes 94
After long debate, Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee 122
Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendments *reported*, and *agreed to*:—To be communicated to the Lords.
Fortifications [Provision for Expenses]—Resolutions in Committee 123
Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday* next.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 19.

The Portadown Inquest—Observations, The Duke of Manchester; Reply, Lord Dufferin 123
University Tests Bill (No. 177)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Earl Russell*) .. 125
After short debate, a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 54, Not-Contents 91; Majority 37.
Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 144
Municipal Franchise Bill (No. 187)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 145
After short debate, further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3^{a} on *Thursday* next; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 200.)
Bishops Resignation Bill (No. 171)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 146
After short debate, further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3^{a} *To-morrow;* and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 201.)
Parliament—Order in the House—Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, Earl Granville:—Short debate thereon 148

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 19.

The Œcumenical Council—Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, Mr. Otway 151
Primary Education—Question, Viscount Sandon; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 152
China — Hong Kong—Legislative Council—Question, Mr. Bowring; Answer, Mr. Monsell 153
Ireland — State Aid to Irish Nonconformists — Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 153

[*July* 19.] *Page*

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CABLES—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 154

ARMY—CAVALRY REGIMENTS FOR INDIA—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 154

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND FRANCE — Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Bright 154

SURPLUS OF THE IRISH CHURCH FUNDS —Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 155

ARMY—DRILLING AT ALDERSHOT—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 156

POOR LAW—VAGRANCY—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 156

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — Questions, Mr. Newdegate, Colonel French; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 157

DUBLIN FREEMEN DISFRANCHISEMENT BILL—Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Sir George Grey 158

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

EDUCATION—SCHOOLS OF SCIENCE—Observations, Mr. Samuelson; Reply, Mr. W. E. Forster 158

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(1.) £560,711, to complete the sum for Public Education (Great Britain.)—After long debate, Vote *agreed to* 163

(2.) £158,253, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 200

(3.) £75,203, to complete the sum for the British Museum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 219

Resolutions to be reported.

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, including the purchase of Pictures."

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*:—Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill [Bill 189]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 226

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to include in a Bill a Commission to inquire into corrupt practices at the Election for Youghal held in November last,"—(*Mr. Collins,*)—instead thereof.

After short debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 184, Noes 78; Majority 106.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) Bill [Bill 216]—

Order for Second Reading read 233

After short debate, Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 215]—

Order for Committee read 234

After short debate, Committee *deferred* till *Tuesday* next, at Two of the clock.

Fortifications [Provision for Expenses] Bill—Resolutions *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Captain Vivian*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 223] 234

Basses Lights (Ceylon) Bill—Resolution *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Grant Duff*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 224] 234

TELEGRAPH BILL—

Select Committee on Telegraph Bill to consist of the Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hunt, and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection 234

Militia Pay Bill—*Presented*, and read the first time 235

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 20.

Irish Church Bill (No. 196)—

Commons' amendments to Lords' amendments and Commons' reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to order).

Moved, That this House do not insist on so much of the amendment made in the preamble, to which the Commons have disagreed, as consists in leaving out the words ("held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion,")—(*The Earl Granville*) 235

After short debate, an Amendment *moved*,

To leave out from ("House") to the end of the motion and insert ("do insist on the amendment made to the preamble to which the Commons have disagreed,")—(*The Duke of Marlborough*) 289

After further short debate, on Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion?—their Lordships *divided*; Contents 95, Not-Contents 173; Majority 78:—*Resolved* in the *Negative*.

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 321

Further debate on Commons' amendments and reasons adjourned to *Thursday* next.

Prevention of Gaming (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Morley*); read 1ª (No. 206) 324

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 20.

ARMY — COURTS MARTIAL — Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 324

ARMY—MILITARY PRISON AT DUBLIN — Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Mr. Vivian 325

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill [Bill 181]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Ayrton*) .. 326

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

And, on July 21, Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 345

PRISONS (RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION)—MOTION FOR RETURNS—

Motion for Address for "Returns of the County and Borough Prisons of England in which Religious Instruction is afforded to Prisoners of different Denominations, specifying which and at what cost to each:

"And, of the number of Prisoners in each Prison, and to what Denomination they belong; the Returns to be made up to the 20th day of July 1869, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 284, of Session 1867-8,"—(*Mr. Maguire*) .. 345

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

[*July* 20.] Page

IRELAND—STATE OF ULSTER—MOTION FOR PAPERS—*Moved,*

"That there be laid before this House, Copies of Reports of the Stipendiary Magistrates relating to the state of Ulster on the 12th day of July 1869,"—(*Mr. William Johnston*) 352

After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill [Bill 23]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [8th June],

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make provision therein for a woman to marry her deceased husband's brother,"—(*Mr. Collins.*)

Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 357

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Order for the Committee on the said Bill be read and discharged,"—(*Mr. John Talbot,*)—instead thereof.

After short debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 143, Noes 57; Majority 86.

Main Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir John Hay:*)—The House *divided;* Ayes 43, Noes 145; Majority 102.

Main Question put, and *negatived.*

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make provision for a man to marry his deceased wife's brother's or sister's daughter,"—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Question put, and *negatived.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Admiralty District Registries Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Graves, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Rathbone*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 229] 367

Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 227] .. 367

Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Ayrton*) .. 367

Militia (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 228] 367

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21.

LANGUAGE USED IN DEBATE IN THE OTHER HOUSE—Question, Mr. Milbank; Answer, Mr. Speaker 368

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill [Bill 4]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [5th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "pending the consideration (by a Committee of the House of Lords) of the whole question of the Law of Hypothec as existing both in Scotland and other countries, it is expedient to delay the further consideration of this Bill,"—(*Lord Elcho,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:—Debate *resumed* 368

After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 127, Noes 91; Majority 36:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for this day month.

Special and Common Juries Bill [Bill 175]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Viscount Enfield*) 398

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for this day month.

[*July* 21.] *Page*

Married Women's Property Bill [Bill 122]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th July], "That the Bill be now read the third time:"—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 401
After short debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 131, Noes 33; Majority 98:—Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 22.

Irish Church Bill (No. 196)—
Commons' amendments to Lords' Amendments and Commons' reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords *further considered* (according to order) 406
Moved, in Clause 2, not to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed,—(*The Earl Granville.*)
After long debate, Motion, That the House do not insist upon the Amendment, *agreed to.*
Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences) .. 442
Moved, Not to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed,—(*The Earl Granville.*)
After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 47, Not-Contents 17; Majority 30.
Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 444
PROTEST THEREON 445
Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus) 446
Then it was *moved,* "Not to insist on the Amendments in Clause 68, to which the Commons disagree, but to leave out the said clause, and to insert the following clause in lieu thereof:—

"And whereas it is further expedient that the proceeds of the said property should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor: Be it further enacted, that the said proceeds shall be so applied accordingly in the manner Parliament shall hereafter direct."

After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* words inserted accordingly.
A Committee appointed to prepare reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on the said amendments: The Committee to meet *forthwith.*
Report read, and agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with amendments and reasons.

Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. Bill [H.L.]—
Presented (*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*); read 1^a (No. 209) .. 447

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 22.

PARLIAMENT—MOSAICS IN THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Layard 448

IRELAND—EXTRA POLICE IN CALEDON ON 12TH JULY—Question, Mr. W. Verner; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 448

INDIA—OPIUM TRADE—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, Mr. Grant Duff 449

SLAVE TRADE FROM THE SOUTH SEA ISLANDS—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Otway 450

SOCIETE AGRICOLE ET INDUSTRIELLE D'EGYPTE—Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Otway 451

UNIVERSITY TESTS BILL AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS—Question, Mr. Sartoris; Answer, The Solicitor General:—Short debate thereon .. 451

[*July* 22.] Page

POLLUTION OF RIVERS—Question, Mr. Dodds; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen 453
NAVY—COASTGUARDSMEN—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Childers 453
ARMY—FIELD DAYS AT ALDERSHOT DURING HOT WEATHER—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 454

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

AFFAIRS OF NEW ZEALAND—Observations, Viscount Bury; Reply, Mr. Monsell:—Long debate thereon 456
ARMY—COMMITTEES ON NEW ARMS—Question, Observations, Colonel Barttelot; Reply, Mr. Cardwell:—Short debate thereon .. 493

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee .. 498

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Question again proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, including the purchase of Pictures."—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*
(2.) £1,110, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.
(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,300, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for Grants in aid of the Expenditure of certain Learned Societies in Great Britain" 503
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £500, for the Royal Academy of Music, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Monk*) .. 505
After short debate, Question put, and *negatived*:—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(4.) £6,449, to complete the sum for the University of London.
(5.) £12,337, to complete the sum for the Scottish Universities.
(6.) £2,100, to complete the sum for the Board of Manufactures (Scotland.)—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 506
(7.) £1,240, to complete the sum for the National Gallery (Ireland.)
(8.) £1,084, to complete the sum for the Royal Irish Academy.
(9.) £1,710, to complete the sum for the Queen's University (Ireland.)
(10.) £2,865, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges (Ireland.)
(11.) £1,250, to complete the sum for the Belfast Theological Professors, &c.
(12.) £9,298, to complete the sum for the Fishery Board (Scotland.)
(13.) £5,391, to complete the sum for the General Register Office (Scotland.)
(14.) £4,166, to complete the sum for the Lunacy Board (Scotland.)
(15.) £9,838, to complete the sum for the Poor Law Administration (Scotland.)—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 507
(16.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,664, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for Expenses of the Lord Lieutenant's Household" 508
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £1,562, 6*s*. 2*d*., for Queen's Plates in Ireland, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Rylands.*)
After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 59, Noes 79; Majority 20.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Craufurd*) 510
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(17.) £15,453, to complete the sum for the Chief Secretary's Offices.
(18.) £100, to complete the sum for the Boundary Survey (Ireland.)
(19.) £1,238, to complete the sum for the Charitable Donations and Bequests Office (Ireland.)
(20.) £13,722, to complete the sum for the General Register Office, &c. (Ireland.)
(21.) £65,328, to complete the sum for the Poor Law Commission (Ireland.)
(22.) £3,182, to complete the sum for the Public Record Office (Ireland.)

Resolutions to be reported.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*July* 22.] *Page*

Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Committee—*continued.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,196, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland" .. 514

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Blake:*)—Motion *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Supply—Resolutions [July 12] *reported* 515
After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 226]—
Order for Third Reading read 520
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Captain Vivian, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 236] 520

Irish Church Bill—

Ordered, That the Commons Amendments to the Lords Amendments to the Irish Church Bill, and the Reasons for disagreeing to several of the Lords Amendments, be *printed.* [Bill 232.]—(*Mr. Walpole*) 520

Accounts, &c. Presentation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 520

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 23.

Irish Church Bill—

Returned from the Commons, with the amendments made by the Lords to the amendments made by the Commons to the amendments made by the Lords, and the consequential amendment, *agreed to;* and the amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons had disagreed and on which the Lords have insisted, *agreed to* 521

Railways (India)—Financial Statement—

Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India). Also, Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9—*Presented* (by command,)—(*The Duke of Argyll*) 521

After debate, Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India) *ordered* to be *printed* (No. 219); Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9 *ordered* to lie on the Table.

Extradition Treaty with France—Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Earl of Clarendon 554

Contagious Diseases Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Northbrook*); read 1^{a} (No. 221) 559

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 23.

Registration, &c. of Newspapers — Questions, Sir John Gray, Mr. Baines; Answers, Mr. Ayrton 559

The Police and the Public—Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Bruce 561

Ceylon — Little Basses Light — Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre 563

Irish Church Bill—
Lords' Amendments to Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments and Reasons *considered* 564

IRISH CHURCH BILL—*continued.*

After debate, Amendments and Reasons read a second time .. 577

Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon its disagreement to the Amendments insisted upon by the Lords; and doth agree to the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, and to the consequential Amendment to the said Bill.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—ARREST OF MR. MURPHY—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the right of free speech is one of the most important safeguards of good Government, and that attacks upon this right are, therefore, dangerous to the welfare of the State:— That the recent conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in preventing free discussion of important topics was, in fact, an attack upon this great safeguard of freedom; and is, therefore, deserving of reprehension by this House:—That this conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department has proved especially mischievous, since it has led to breaches of the law on the part of official persons, more particularly by the Mayor of Birmingham, who caused the arrest of an innocent person for the purpose of preventing what to him was distasteful discussion,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)—instead thereof 592

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, it being ten minutes to Seven of the clock, Debate *adjourned* till *this day.*

TURNPIKES—Observations, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Reply, Sir George Jenkinson 619

[The Sitting was then suspended.]

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—ARREST OF MR. MURPHY—RESOLUTION—Debate *resumed:*—After further debate, Question put, and *agreed to* .. 620

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

NAVY—NAVAL AND MILITARY CONTRACTS—Observations, Mr. Muntz; Reply, Mr. Baxter:—Short debate thereon 633

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn.* Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next. [House counted out.]

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 26.

PURCHASES FOR THE NATIONAL GALLERY—THE "REMBRANDT"—Questions, Lord De L'Isle and Dudley, The Earl of Winchilsea; Answers, Earl Granville, Lord Overstone:—Short debate thereon 651

POLICE (IRELAND)—Observations, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, Lord Dufferin 665

Evidence Amendment Bill (No. 110)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Penzance*) .. 670

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

Bankruptcy Bill (No. 208)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 678

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

Imprisonment for Debt Bill (No. 168)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 681

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 224.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 26.

Shipping Dues in Foreign Ports—Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Mr. Otway 682

Ireland — Lunatics — Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 683

Factory and Workshops Act — Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bruce 683

Ireland—District Asylums—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 684

Army — Military Labour — Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 684

Accidents in Mines—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Bruce .. 685

SUPPLY—Civil Service Estimates—Resolutions [July 22] *reported* .. 686

After short debate, First Eleven Resolutions *agreed to.*

Twelfth Resolution read a second time.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£9,298," and insert "£3,531 6*s.* 7*d.*,"—(*Mr. Craufurd,*)—instead thereof.

After short debate, Question put, "That '£9,298' stand part of the said Resolution:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 150, Noes 45; Majority 105:—Resolution *agreed to:*—Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Board of Trade Returns—Observations, Mr. Graves; Reply, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre:—Short debate thereon 697

India—Red Sea Route to India—Observations, Sir James Elphinstone; Reply, Mr. Childers 706

Parliament—Decoration of the Central Hall—Motion for a Select Committee—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances under which a contract or agreement was made by the Office of Works with the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) for the decoration of the Central Hall of the Palace of Westminster,"—(*Mr. Raikes,*)—instead thereof 708

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Army—Major M'Guire's Camping System—Motion for Papers—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of all Reports and Correspondence on the subject of Major M'Guire's Camping System, from the first Report by Lord W. Paulett, in 1864, to the present date,"—(*Mr. Knight,*)—instead thereof 720

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Railway Accidents—Question, Observations, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Reply, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre 725

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—Civil Service Estimates—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £191,950, to complete the sum for Public Education in Ireland.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 727

(2.) £530, to complete the sum for the Education Commissioners' Office (Ireland).

Supply—Committee—*continued.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,196, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland" .. 742

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,609, &c.,"—(*Mr. Blake*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock; Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Telegraph (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 233]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"—(*The Marquess of Hartington*) 746

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee, to examine and take evidence upon the Contracts entered into with the several Telegraphic, Railway, and Canal Companies, with a view to determine whether they are of the character of fraudulent or of improvident Contracts contemplated in the Resolution of this House of the 24th day of July 1860; and to examine the calculations upon which the Estimates of Receipt and Expenditure, as set forth in the Reports of Mr. Scudamore and in the Statement of the Postmaster General when submitting Resolutions upon this subject, are based, with a view to determine whether there is any reasonable prospect that said Estimates may be realized,"—(*Mr. Robert Torrens,*)—instead thereof .. 751

After debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 148, Noes 23; Majority 125.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee 763

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Accounts, &c. Presentation Bill—*Presented,* and read the first time [Bill 240] .. 773

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 27.

Tenants' Purchase by Instalments (Ireland) Bill (No. 161)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Dunsany*) .. 773

After short debate, Motion and Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Tenure (Ireland) Bill (No. 36)—

Moved, "That the Order for the House to be put into Committee be discharged,"—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) 776

Motion *agreed to*:—Order *discharged.*

New Zealand — Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Granville:—Debate thereon 778

Weights and Measures (India)—Address for Papers—Motion for

Address for Copy of despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, of the 6th November 1868, relating to Weights and Measures for India, omitting enclosures: Also,

Correspondence between the India Office and the Board of Trade on the same subject, omitting enclosures, with the exception of a minute by Mr. H. T. Prinsep, Member of the Indian Council, and of a letter from the Warden of the Standards; also further minutes by Mr. Prinsep: And also,

Copy of despatch from the Secretary of State to the Government of India, dated 10th June 1869, omitting enclosures,—(*The Earl Fortescue*) 795

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Straits Settlements Bill [h.l.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Granville*); read 1ª (No. 231) 796

Millbank Prison Bill [h.l.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Northbrook*); read 1ª (No. 234) 796

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 27.

Page

INDIA — RAILWAY EXTENSION — Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 797

NAVY—CHANNEL AND MEDITERRANEAN FLEETS—Question, Captain Egerton; Answer, Mr. Childers 797

SCOTLAND—WATERNISH CHURCH—Question, Mr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Bruce 798

SCOTLAND—THE CUMBRAE LIGHTS—Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre 799

INDIA — ROUTE TO CHINA, &c. — Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 799

DIVIDENDS ON GOVERNMENT SECURITIES—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Ayrton 800

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 215]—
Order for Committee read 800
After debate, Bill *considered* in Committee 817
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday*. [House counted out]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 28.

IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME—Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 839

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill [Bill 71]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Gilpin*) .. 840
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. J. D. Lewis*) 860
After long debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 58, Noes 118; Majority 60.
Division List, Ayes and Noes 877
Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *put off* for three months.

Game Laws (Scotland) Bill (*Lord Elcho*) [Bill 36]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Lord Elcho*) .. 879
After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 244] 885

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 29.

Ecclesiastical Courts Bill (No. 191)—
After short debate, Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn* .. 885

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill (No. 217)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 886
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Bankruptcy Bill (No. 207-8)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 889
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments; further Amendments made:—Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. Bill (No. 209)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol*) 890
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 29.

Page

Poor Law—Keighley Union—Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Goschen 891

Navy—Fresh Water for the Fleet—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Childers 892

Scotch and Irish Fisheries—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Childers 893

The Coronation Oath—Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Attorney General 893

Army—Moncrieff Gun-Carriages—Question, Captain Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 895

Army—Case of Dr. MacLoughlin—Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Captain Vivian 896

Friendly Societies' Acts—Question, Mr. W. Lowther; Answer, Mr. Bruce 896

Mexican Bondholders—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Otway 897

Navy—Admiralty Contractors—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Baxter 897

Parliament—Reporters' Gallery—Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Mr. Layard 898

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

- Army—Officers of the Army in Japan—Observations, Colonel North; Reply, Mr. Stansfeld:—Short debate thereon 899
- Parliament—Business of the House—Observations, Mr. Bruce; Replies, Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Mr. Charley 905
- Coronation Oath—Question, Observations, Mr. Charley; Reply, The Attorney General 906

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Civil Service Estimates .. 908

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £27,835, to complete the sum for Law Charges.
(2.) £116,973, to complete the sum for Criminal Prosecutions, Sheriffs' Expenses, &c.
(3.) £45,242, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts.
(4.) £325,575, to complete the sum for County Courts.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 909
(5.) £61,733, to complete the sum for Probate Courts.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 909
(6.) £8,870, to complete the sum for Admiralty Court Registry.
(7.) £3,490, to complete the sum for Land Registry Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 910
(8.) £21,224, to complete the sum for Police Courts (London and Sheerness).
(9.) £141,449, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police.
(10.) £235,000, to complete the sum for County and Borough Police, Great Britain.
(11.) £208,712, to complete the sum for Government Prisons, England, and Transportation.
(12.) £175,632, to complete the sum for County Prisons and Reformatories, Great Britain.
(13.) £21,910, to complete the sum for Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.
(14.) £14,335, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges.
(15.) £50,198, to complete the sum for Criminal Proceedings in Scotland.
(16.) £36,764, to complete the sum for Courts of Law and Justice (Scotland).
(17.) £15,099, to complete the sum for Register House Departments (Scotland).
(18.) £16,949, to complete the sum for Prisons in Scotland.
(19.) £58,364, to complete the sum for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions in Ireland.
(20.) £29,379, to complete the sum for Court of Chancery (Ireland).
(21.) £20,097, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts (Ireland).

SUPPLY—Committee—*continued.*

(22.) £5,510, to complete the sum for Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland).
(23.) £9,003, to complete the sum for Landed Estates Court (Ireland).—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 911
(24.) £7,380, to complete the sum for Probate Court (Ireland).
(25.) £1,130, to complete the sum for Admiralty Court Registry (Ireland).—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 911
(26.) £9,857, to complete the sum for Registry of Deeds in Ireland.
(27.) £2,262, to complete the sum for Registry of Judgments in Ireland.
(28.) £65,043, to complete the sum for Dublin Metropolitan Police.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 912
(29.) £603,544, to complete the sum for Constabulary (Ireland).
(30.) £14,193, to complete the sum for Government Prisons and Reformatories in Ireland.
(31.) £6,000, to complete the sum for County Prisons in Ireland.
(32.) £3,272, to complete the sum for Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 913
(33.) £1,730, to complete the sum for Four Courts Marshalsea Prison.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 913
(34.) £5,820, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges in Ireland.
(35.) £85,452, to complete the sum for Convict Establishments in the Colonies.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £155,667, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Missions and Embassies Abroad" .. 913
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £145,667, &c.,"—(*Mr. Rylands.*)—After long debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 66, Noes 66.
The Chairman having declared himself with the Noes, Original Question again proposed. After further short debate,
(36.) Motion made, and Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £155,367, &c.,"—(*Mr. Otway,*)—put, and *agreed to* 952
(37.) £174,451, to complete the sum for Consular Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 952
(38.) £46,298, to complete the sum for Colonies, Grants in Aid.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 954
(39.) £3,134, to complete the sum for Orange River Territory and St. Helena.
(40.) £5,360, to complete the sum for Slave Trade, Commissions for Suppression of.
(41.) £23,343, to complete the sum for Tonnage Bounties, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 960
(42.) £9,500, to complete the sum for Emigration.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 962
(43.) £500, to complete the sum for Coolie Emigration.
(44.) £9,047, to complete the sum for Treasury Chest.
(45.) £171,877, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 963
(46.) £31,600, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.
(47.) £30,400, to complete the sum for Relief of Distressed British Seamen.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 965
(48.) £27,320, to complete the sum for Non-conforming Clergy.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 966
(49.) £13,045, to complete the sum for Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland.
(50.) £4,825, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c. Great Britain.
(51.) £4,834, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c. Ireland.
(52.) £31,000, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 966
(53.) £31,147, to complete the sum for Local Dues on Shipping.
(54.) £380, to complete the sum for Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c.
(55.) £2,000, to complete the sum for Flax Cultivation (Ireland).—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 968
(56.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,247, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for certain Miscellaneous Expenses" 968
Motion made, and Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,804 6*s*., &c.,"—(*Mr. Fawcett:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived:*—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock; Committee to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

[*July* 29.] Page

Telegraph Bill [Bill 233]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 974
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Secretary Bruce*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 245] 978

Offices Abolition Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Ayrton*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 246] 978

Dividends on Public Stocks Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 247] 978

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 30.

Married Women's Property Bill (No. 212)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Penzance*) .. 978
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Evidence Amendment Bill (No. 110)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 987
Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 239.)

Contagious Diseases Animals Bill (No. 217)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 989
Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 240.)

Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) Bill (No. 126)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Morley*) .. 992
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 30.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT — Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce 995

ARMY— PROMOTION IN THE NON-PURCHASE CORPS—Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 995

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—HOGARTH'S PORTRAIT—Observations, Mr. Disraeli 996

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—*considered* in Committee .. 997

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £1,008,343, CUSTOMS
(2.) £1,604,616, INLAND REVENUE.
(3.) £2,362,841, POST OFFICE.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1001
(4.) £709,780, POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE; no part of which sum is to be applicable or applied in or towards making any payment in respect of any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863 to Mr. Joseph George Churchward, or to any person claiming through or under him by virtue of a certain Contract, bearing date the 26th day of April 1859, made between the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Admiralty (for and on behalf of Her Majesty) of the first part, and the said Joseph George Churchward of the second part, or in or towards the satisfaction of any claim whatsoever of the said Joseph George Churchward, by virtue of that Contract, so far as relates to any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1002
(5.) £90,000, TELEGRAPH SERVICE.
(6.) £5,000, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1003

Supply—Committee—*continued.*

(7.) £5,000, to complete the sum for Military Prisoners.
(8.) £88,500, Court of Chancery.
(9.) £49,500, Court of Bankruptcy.
(10.) £1,200, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department.
(11.) £8,000, Endowed Schools, England, Commission.
(12.) £30,000, to complete the sum for Superannuations and Retired Allowances.
(13.) £4,500, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.
(14.) £68,118, Greenwich Hospital and Schools.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill [Bill 223]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Cardwell*) 1003

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Taylor,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 100, Noes 32; Majority 68.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee 1008

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Ways and Means—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Roman Catholic Charities—Motion for Returns—

Amendment proposed

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "there be laid before this House, a Return showing the number of Deeds or Instruments enrolled during the last three years in the High Court of Chancery under the Act 23 and 24 Vic. c. 134, being an Act to amend the Law regarding the Roman Catholic Charities, and under any subsequent Act relating to or enlarging or extending the said Act, giving the names of the Trustees; the date of their execution of such deeds or instruments; and a summary or short description, together with the number of acres, of the property to which such deeds or instruments relate,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)—instead thereof 1014

After debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 58, Noes 50; Majority 8.

Communication with China—Question, Observations, Mr. Baines; Reply, Mr. Grant Duff:—Debate thereon 1032

Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol—Observations, Mr. Buxton; Reply, Mr. Monsell:—Short debate thereon 1048

Currency Laws—Observations, Mr. Delahunty; Reply, Mr. Ayrton .. 1053

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered* in Committee; Resolutions *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow* 1054

East India Loan Bill—Resolution *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 251] .. 1054

Harbour of Galle Loan Bill—Resolution *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 250] 1054

Houses of Parliament—Plans for New Dining Rooms and Ladies' Gallery, &c.—

Select Committee *appointed,* "to consider Plans for New Refreshment and Dining Rooms for both Houses of Parliament, and for Improvements in the Ladies' Gallery of the House of Commons:—List of the Committee 1054

COMMONS, SATURDAY, JULY 31.

Page

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) (*re-committed*) **Bill**
Bill *considered* in Committee 1055
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*); *presented,* and read the first time 1060

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 2.

Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds Bill (No. 215)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1061
Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months,")—(*The Lord St. Leonards.*)
After short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:*—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed to* a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill (No. 236)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read .. 1067
After short debate, House in Committee.
An Amendment made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) Bill (No. 226)—
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" .. 1068
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—House in Committee accordingly:—Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3^{a} *To-morrow.*

Seeds Adulteration Bill (No. 242)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 1076
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill (No. 210)—
On Order of the Day for the Second Reading, *Moved,* "That the Order of the Day for the Second Reading be discharged,"—(*The Chairman of Committees*) 1077
After short debate, on Question? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 32, Not-Contents 33: Majority 1:—*Resolved* in the *Negative:*—Order of the Day read accordingly.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Lord Lurgan.*)
An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months,")—(*The Earl Beauchamp.*)
After further short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 29, Not-Contents 27: Majority 2:—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative:*—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Education Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Stratheden*); read 1^{a} (No. 259) .. 1086

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 2.

HERTS CONSTABULARY—Question, Mr. C. Reed; Answer, Mr. Bruce .. 1086

ARMY — SOLDIERS' EMPLOYMENT — Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1087

EGYPT—SUEZ CANAL—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Otway .. 1087

IRELAND—GLEBES AND GLEBE HOUSES—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue 1088

RAILWAY GUARDS' AND PASSENGERS' COMMUNICATION—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Bright 1088

[*August* 2.] *Page*

ARMY—SPITHEAD FORTS—Question, Captain Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1089

PATENT LAWS—Question, Mr. Macfie; Answer, Mr. Bright .. 1089

INDIA—PRINCE AZEEM JAH—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1090

INDIA—CALCUTTA PORT DUES—Question, Mr. Armitstead; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1091

INDIA—RAILWAYS—Question, Sir S. Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1091

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS—

Moved, "That Government Orders of the Day have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday, August 3 and 4,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) 1092

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Bankruptcy Bill—

Lords Amendments *considered* 1093

After short debate, several *agreed to;* several *disagreed to;* several amended, and *agreed to*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:" —List of the Committee 1093

Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords' Amendments *reported* .. 1125

After short debate, Reasons *agreed to:* To be communicated to the Lords.

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 164]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 27th July*] 1095

After long debate, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Bishops Resignation Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 241]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*) 1125

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill [Bill 238]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1127

After short debate, Amendments made:—Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan (Guarantee) Bill—Resolution *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 253] 1134

Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Adam*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 254] 1134

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 3.

Telegraphs Bill (No. 243)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1135

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill (No. 261)—

Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments 1137

After short debate, Amendments made; Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill (No. 236)—

Amendment *reported* (according to Order) 1138

Amendment *agreed to:*—Bill to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill (No. 210)—

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee,"—(*The Lord Lurgan*) 1138

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months,")—(*The Earl of Longford.*)

After short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*:—House in Committee accordingly; Bill *reported* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill (No. 251)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Northbrook*) .. 1139

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Railways Abandonment Bill (No. 249)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal*) .. 1139

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

NATIONAL GALLERY—RESOLUTION—

Moved to resolve, That henceforth it be an instruction to Mr. Boxall, R.A., to buy no picture in England without previously submitting it to the judgment of the Trustees of the National Gallery, or any picture in foreign parts which has not got an authentic pedigree from the date of its being painted by the master to whom it is ascribed to the day of purchase, unless by special permission in writing from the aforesaid Trustees—(*The Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham*) 1140

After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 3.

INFANTICIDE—Question, Mr. Raikes; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1143

COURTS OF JUSTICE—CAREY STREET SITE—Questions, Mr. Monk; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Ayrton 1143

SCOTLAND—DISTRIBUTOR OF STAMPS FOR AYRSHIRE—Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Mr. Ayrton 1144

INDIA—TROOPS IN BHOOTAN—MEDAL FOR FRONTIER SERVICE—Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff .. 1144

UNION OF PARISHES IN WESTMINSTER—Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1145

INDIA—PUNJAUB TENANCY ACT—Question, Mr. C. Denison; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1145

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1146

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—*considered* in Committee 1147

Moved, "That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1868 was £48,534,412; the total of the direct claims upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium was £8,957,464; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £32,362,402; the value of Stores supplied from England was £970,926; the charges in England were £5,710,880; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,540,435, making a total charge for the same year of £49,542,107; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £1,007,695; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £602,462, and that including that charge the excess of Expenditure over Income was £1,610,157,"—(*Mr. Grant Duff.*)

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day.*

IRELAND—TRINITY COLLEGE (DUBLIN)—RESOLUTION—*Moved*,
"That, in the opinion of this House, those who are not members of the Established Church cannot be placed in a position of equality with regard to University Education in Ireland until all the Fellowships and Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, are freed from all religious disabilities,"—(*Mr. Fawcett*) 1197
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

NATIONAL DEBT—RESOLUTION—*Moved*,
"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that steps should be taken gradually to reduce the National Debt,"—(*Mr. Lambert*) 1211
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

SIERRA LEONE—CASE OF THOMAS *v.* HUGGINS—RESOLUTION—*Moved*,
"That, in the opinion of this House, a Court of Inquiry should be held at Sierra Leone to investigate the charges against Mr. Horatio James Huggins, the Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, contained in the Petition from that Settlement sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies,"—(*Mr. Henry Brinsley Sheridan*) 1214
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MARLBOROUGH STREET POLICE COURT—MOTION FOR PAPERS—*Moved*,
"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Papers relating to the Charge made by the Police against three young men on the night of the 30th June last, and tried before Mr. Knox, the Police Magistrate at Marlborough Street,"—(*Mr. Eykyn*) 1218
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 215]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 2nd August*] 1229
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Attorneys' and Solicitors' Remuneration Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Morley, Mr. George Gregory*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 260] 1246

Benefit Building Societies Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Gourley, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Stevenson*) 1246

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 261] .. 1246

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4.

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4.

MALT TAX—Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1247

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN PARAGUAY—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Otway 1248

UNITED STATES—ISLAND OF SAN JUAN—Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Otway 1248

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN THE LEVANT—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Otway 1250

ASSESSED TAX PAPERS—Questions, Sir George Jenkinson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1250

CATTLE PLAGUE—FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1252

SCOTLAND—POOR LAW AMENDMENT—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1253

[*August* 4.] *Page*

Habitual Criminals Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 73]—
Order for Committee read 1253
After debate, Bill *considered* in Committee 1273
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Order for Third Reading read 1282
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5.

Seeds Adulteration Bill (No. 242)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read .. 1283
After short debate, House in Committee accordingly; Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow*, and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 276.)

Bankruptcy Bill (No. 265)—
Commons' Amendments *considered;* and after short debate, on Question? *agreed to* 1284

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill (No. 189)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Lord Lurgan*) .. 1285
After short debate, an Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months,")—(*The Earl of Longford*.)
After further short debate, on Question, that ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*:—Bill read 3ª accordingly.
After further short debate, Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

Creditors Sequestrations Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Harrowby*); read 1ª (No. 275) 1291

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5.

NAVY—PURE LIME JUICE—Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Baxter.. 1291
ARMY—BALL AMMUNITION IN BARRACKS—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1292
CANADA—PATENT LAW—Question, Mr. Bentall; Answer, Mr. Monsell:—Short debate thereon 1292
UNITED STATES—CONSULATE AT CHICAGO—Question, Mr. Bowring; Answer, Mr. Otway 1293
CASE OF JAMES BELL—Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Bruce .. 1294
INDIA—BANK OF BENGAL—Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1295
SCOTLAND — PUBLIC BUSINESS—Questions, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Bouverie; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1296

Bishops Resignation Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 241]—
Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*) 1297
After debate, Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Hadfield*,)—instead thereof 1306
After further debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 112, Noes 26; Majority 86.
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee 1316
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*, and to be *printed*. [Bill 263.]

[*August* 5.] *Page*

Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan Bill [Bill 253]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Stansfeld*) .. 1324
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month,"—(*Mr. Monk.*)
After short debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 65, Noes 10; Majority 55:—Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill [Bill 238]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd August], "That the Bill be now read the third time:"—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 1335
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House in respect of a proviso to Clause 22, and a new Clause for restricting the sale of park lands,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith,*)—instead thereof.
After short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to*:—Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

East India Revenue Accounts—
Considered in Committee [*Progress 3rd August*] 1343
After long time spent therein, Resolution *agreed to*:—To be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Government of India Act Amendment Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 150]—
Order for Committee read 1361
Moved, "That the Bill [and the Governor General of India Bill] be referred to a Select Committee next Session,"—(*Mr. Kinnaird.*)
Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Bill *considered* in Committee.
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Governor General of India Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 89]—
Order for Committee read 1368
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.
Bill *reported,* with Amendments, and an amended Title; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Habitual Criminals Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 73]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1368
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock, and to be *printed.* [Bill 264.]

Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment Bill—
Lords' Amendments *considered* 1369
Several *agreed to*; and one *disagreed to.*
Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee.
Reason for disagreeing to one of the Lords' Amendments *reported,* and *agreed to*:—To be communicated to the Lords.

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 6.

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 6.

Army — Henry-Martini Rifle — Questions, Mr. Muntz, Lord Elcho; Answers, Captain Vivian 1370

Dagenham Dock Company — Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1371

Railway Signalling—Question, Major Walker; Answer, Mr. Bright .. 1372

Inequality of Sentences—Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1373

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 215]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 3rd August*] 1374

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day*.

Transit of Venus (1874)—*considered* in Committee 1394

After short time spent therein,

Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the carrying out of the arrangements necessary for observing the Transit of Venus which will take place in the year 1874; and to assure Her Majesty that this House will make good any expense that may be incurred thereby."

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*.

Adjournment of the House—

Moved, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next,"—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 1395

Marriage Laws—Observations, Question, Sir Roundell Palmer; Reply, Mr. Bruce:—Short debate thereon 1395

The Gold Coinage—Observations, Mr. J. B. Smith; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Short debate thereon 1408

Ireland—Fenian Convict O'Donovan Rossa—Observations, Mr. G. H. Moore; Reply, Mr. Bruce:—Short debate thereon 1422

Railway Guards' and Passengers' Communication—Question, Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Reply, Mr. Bright 1433

Liabilities of Railway Companies—Observations, Mr. C. Denison; Reply, Mr. Bright 1434

Canadian Boundaries—Question, Observations, Viscount Milton; Reply, Mr. Otway 1440

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 215]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1442

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

LORDS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 7.

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill—Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, Earl Granville 1451

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 7.

Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 215]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1452

After short debate, Bill to be read the third time upon *Monday*, and to be *printed*. [Bill 265.]

Endowed Schools (No. 2) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 154]—
Order for Committee read 1466
Moved, "That the Order for Committee be discharged,"—(*Mr. W. E. Forster.*)
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Order *discharged*; Bill *withdrawn*.

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 9.

Bishops Resignation Bill (No. 201)—
Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1469
After short debate, Commons' Amendments *agreed to*, with an Amendment; and Bill, with the Amendments, returned to the Commons.

Habitual Criminals Bill (No. 41)—
Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1469
After short debate, Commons' Amendments *agreed to.*

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill (No. 119)—
Bill, returned from the Commons *agreed to*, with Amendments .. 1470
Moved, That the Commons' Amendments be considered To-morrow,—(*The Duke of Argyll.*)
Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("To-morrow,") and insert ("this day three months,")—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)
After debate, on Question, That ("To-morrow") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 43, Not-Contents 55; Majority 12.
Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 1483
Resolved in the *Negative*, and Amendments to be considered *this day three months.*

The Canning Statue—Question, Lord Stratheden; Answer, Earl Granville 1484

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 9.

Parliament—Private Bills—Standing Orders—
After short debate,
New Standing Order to follow Standing Order 70, *agreed to.*
Standing Order 70 read, and *repealed.*
New Standing Order in place of Standing Order 70, repealed and *agreed to.*
Standing Order 77 read and amended, by leaving out in line 4, the word "or," and inserting after "71," the words "or 72."
Ordered, That the said Orders be Standing Orders of this House,"—(*Mr. Dodson*) .. 1485

Appointment of Revising Barristers—Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1487

Navy—Corruption in the Admiralty Departments—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Childers 1489

India—Telegraphic Communication—Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1490

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill—Conveyance of Cattle—Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1491

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill—Slaughter of Cattle—Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1492

The Colne Fishery—Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Bruce .. 1493

Army—Wimbledon Review—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Captain Vivian 1493

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 265]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) 1495
Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House, in respect of an Amendment to Schedule (A),"—(*Lord Elcho*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House:"—After further short debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Order for Third Reading *discharged*:—Bill *re-committed* in respect of Clauses 13, 16, 21, 23, 28, 65, and the Schedule,—(*The Lord Advocate*:)—*Considered* in Committee, and *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, *considered*.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time:"—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

Merchant Shipping and Navigation Bill—

Acts read; *considered* in Committee 1499

After debate, a Resolution *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson*, *Mr. Shaw Lefevre*, *Mr. John Bright*); *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 267.]

Accidents in Coal Mines—Motion for Papers—*Moved*,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Memorial presented to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, praying for special inquiry into the recent Accidents in Coal Mines,"—(*Lord Elcho*) 1517

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. M'Laren*, *Mr. Craufurd*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 266] 1523

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 10.

New Courts of Justice—Report of Select Committee—Observations, Lord Denman 1523

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill (No. 119)—

Moved, "That this Bill, as amended by the Commons, be reprinted,"—(*Lord Redesdale*) 1524
Motion *agreed to*.

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—

Report from the Select Committee *considered* (according to order), and *agreed to* .. 1524

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 10.

Clerks in the Customs—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Ayrton 1525

Italy—Arrest of Mr. Nathan—Question, Mr. P. A Taylor; Answer, Mr. Otway 1526

Navy—Admiralty Accounts—Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Childers 1526

Melting of English Sovereigns—Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1527

Navy—West Coast of Africa—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Childers 1527

Bristol Pilots at Falmouth—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1528

The Thames Embankment and the Metropolitan Railway Company—Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 1528

[*August* 10.] *Page*

New Courts of Justice—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1529

Inequality of Sentences—Observations, Mr. Bruce 1530

The Gold Coinage—Question, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1532

Foreign Office Agencies — Question, Sir Henry Bulwer; Answer, Mr. Otway 1534

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill — Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1534

Appointment of Revising Barristers—Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1535

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards Her Majesty's Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for Proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Thursday the 28th Day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Thursday the 28th day of October next.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11.

Appointment of Revising Barristers—Question, Mr. West; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1541

Licenses on Cabs and Omnibuses — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bruce 1541

Burglaries at Staines—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bruce .. 1542

Jamaica — Jamaica Clergy Act — Question, Mr. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Monsell 1542

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The Lords Commissioners in the House of Peers .. 1543

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

Friday, July 30.

For *New Sarum*, *v.* Edward William Terrick Hamilton, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

Tuesday, August 3.

For *Antrim*, *v.* Rear Admiral George Henry Seymour, C.B., deceased.

Monday, August 9.

For *Caithness-shire*, *v.* George Traill, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

First Session OF THE *Twentieth Parliament* OF THE
United Kingdom OF *Great Britain* AND *Ireland*,
Appointed TO MEET 10 December, 1868, IN THE
Thirty-Second Year OF THE Reign OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 16*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Greenwich Hospital (165); Stipendiary Magistrates (Deputies)* (179); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act (1860) Amendment* (159); Court of Session Act (1868) Amendment* (164); Local Government Supplemental* (140).

Referred to Select Committee—Imprisonment for Debt (168).

Committee—Bankruptcy (154).

Committee — *Report* — Pensions Commutation* (138); Judicial Statistics (Scotland)* (151).

Third Reading—Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster)* (186); Diplomatic Salaries, &c.* (128); Poor Law Board Provisional Orders Confirmation* (142), and *passed.*

GREENWICH HOSPITAL BILL—(No. 165.)

(*The Earl of Camperdown*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, its object was to extend the principle of the Act of 1865, the policy of which, originated by the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Somerset), was deliberately approved by Parliament. That Act admitted to the benefits of the Hospital all seamen and marines as long as they were infirm and helpless, and it established a system of out-patients, giving the inmates the option of returning home, and offering to all seamen fifty-five years of age, who had been for five years naval pensioners, a pension of 5*d.*, and to all seamen seventy years of age, who had been ten years naval pensioners, 9*d.* a day. Within the last three or four months this great boon, which applied to seamen whether they had been in the Hospital or not, had been carried out. The present Bill was to be read by that Act. It proposed no alteration in the terms of admission, but it went a little further with regard to out-patients, offering resident inmates, if they chose to return to their homes, the retention of their naval pension of 5*d.* or 9*d.* a day, and also such further special pension as, if they had been inmates before the 1st of January last, would make up the sum to £36 10*s.* a year, and if admitted since to £27 10*s.* a year. The 4th clause allowed invalids who had been admitted to the benefits of the Greenwich Hospital infirmary the same advantages; but the pension would be granted only as long as they were infirm and helpless. The system of out-patients was recommended in 1860, by the Commission presided over by Sir William Hutt, and in 1864 the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Somerset) wrote a celebrated Memorandum upon it, which resulted in the Act of 1865. In October of that year, when it came into force, 987 out of 1,382 in-pensioners at once left, of whom only thirty-one had returned; and their health had much improved, the death-rate being now only 6·4 per cent, as compared with an average for twenty years of 12·3 per cent. The income of the Hospital was now between £137,000 and £138,000, and in the present year it was proposed to expend £13,000 on the infirmary, it being calculated that 200 men would remain there, though he believed the number would really be much less. With reference to the "Greenwich sixpence"—a monthly contribution which every merchant seaman up to 1834 was obliged to make—the Admiralty had felt that the men who had thus contributed had an equitable claim, though not a legal right, and they, therefore, proposed to pay over £4,000 per annum to the Board of Trade, for the benefit of men who had contributed for ten years prior to 1834, and who were at that time eighteen years of age. The recipients would, therefore, be upwards of sixty years of age; and as the pensions allotted lapsed the funds would be applied to out-pensions for the seamen of the Royal Navy. The buildings it was intended to utilize for purposes connected with the naval service, by assigning them to some department of the Government or to any charitable society. Even if no rent were received, a sum of £5,000, now expended in keeping up the Hospital, would thus be saved; the right, however, of resuming possession at a month's notice would be reserved to the Admiralty. The noble Earl concluded by moving that the Bill be now read a second time.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE HOUSE.

RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: Your Lordships will remember that a Select Committee was appointed last year to consider whether any and what arrangements could be made to remedy the defective construction of the House, with reference to hearing; and that after a number of sittings, we presented a Report, which contained some interesting designs by Mr. Barry, the architect. The recommendations of that Report, however, have not been carried out, because the Members were equally divided in opinion as to some of them. I think there will be no difference of opinion among your Lordships, as to the very defective acoustic properties of the House. I admit that noble Lords sitting on the Treasury or front Opposition Bench have facilities for speaking and hearing; but the majority who sit on the back Benches, and below the Gangway, are very inconveniently situated. There is a large space overhead, and also a large space underground—for there are catacombs or chambers extending the whole length of the House—to which the voice penetrates. It is quite true that other Legislative Chambers, such as those at Paris, Florence, and Washington, are all much larger than this; but their construction is much more convenient for their objects, and much better adapted for hearing. In each there is a tribune, or some place from which the Members speak. As to the remedy, I have no doubt. I believe it consists in a smaller chamber for ordinary purposes and ordinary business, when you meet in small numbers, and when the business may be fairly transacted within a smaller area. Various designs were drawn up by Mr. Barrry for the assistance of the Committee on that point; and some of the Committee were of opinion that the robing room might, at an expense of £40,000, be converted into a chamber with good acoustic properties and convenient access, containing 321 seats, as compared with 466 in the present House. The Committee, however, were equally divided on that point; and a tie being always regarded as a negative, I will not enter further into that proposal. I will now deal with the improvements which I think may be made in the present House. If you desire to make this

Chamber a satisfactory one for speaking and hearing, three improvements are required. You might lower the ceiling, as in the House of Commons; and I have very little doubt that the result would be satisfactory; but, on the other hand, you would greatly detract from the architectural proportions of the room. Secondly, you might have a glass screen behind the upper Bench and the Woolsack, and so limit the area within which our discussions are carried on. This plan, however, a small majority of the Committee disapproved. Thirdly—and this, perhaps, would be the greatest improvement — you might project the Galleries further, which would greatly enlarge the space at your disposal, and, I believe, would act as a kind of sounding board. All these propositions, however, were negatived by the Committee; and, inasmuch as I was Chairman, I am performing simply a Ministerial duty in laying their recommendations before the House — leaving it to your Lordships to act as you may think proper. The improvements to which, with one exception, we unanimously agreed, are of a minor kind, but, I believe, would materially conduce to the comfort and general convenience of the House. The first is, that the seats in the body of the House be so re-arranged as to allow an additional interval, not exceeding six inches, between the second and third Benches. Now, the width of this building is exactly the same as that of the House of Commons, and the number of Benches is also the same; but the interval between the second and third is, for some unaccountable reason, six inches less than in that House. I propose to enlarge the interval to that extent, which would be convenient to many of your Lordships. Of course, this would, to a certain extent, narrow the floor, but only to a slight degree, and it would but make it the same width as that of the House of Commons. Secondly, I propose that the Gangways, on each side of the Treasury and front Opposition Benches, be widened by six inches. It must have been observed how frequently the Gangways are incommoded by Peers passing and re-passing; and though this alteration would involve the narrowing of the table, it should be remembered that it is constructed for four persons, and that only three sit at it. The third proposal is, that the further part of the space below the Bar should be screened off, in accordance with Mr. Barry's design. It now is rather a corridor, connecting the two side Lobbies, than the Bar itself; and it is constantly crowded, sometimes by Members of the House of Commons, but oftener by strangers, agents, and persons on business, who retire thither to discuss the details of Bills which are before the House, or other matters. The hum of conversation thence arising is often very considerable, and is an inconvenience both to your Lordships and to the reporters in the performance of their duties. I propose that this space should remain as a passage, and to this I think there can be but little objection. The fourth proposition is a somewhat larger one. At present the space immediately below the Bar is partly occupied by chairs and seats, usually occupied by ladies. It has been proposed that these chairs should be removed, the ladies being transferred to one of the Galleries which are now occupied by Members of the House of Commons, and that the whole of that space should be re-seated. You have at present twenty seats below the Bar, and you would thus obtain sixty additional seats, the whole or a considerable proportion of which the Committee wished to be allotted to Members of the House of Commons. I am quite aware that such a course would be returning good for evil, for the House of Commons, in a recent re-construction of their House, have removed us from the seats under the Gallery which we were accustomed to use when we visited that House, and have sent us to a most inconvenient place upstairs, where we cannot hear the debates so satisfactorily. This, too, is a serious inconvenience to Public Business, for there was formerly no better opportunity of arranging and discussing points of importance between Members of both Houses than that afforded under the Gallery. I should be the last, however, to wish to retaliate on the House of Commons by any hostile arrangement. I believe they acted under great pressure in regard to space, and I should hope that they will, on public grounds, re-consider the question. Meanwhile, if we have an opportunity of affording them greater comfort, it is our duty and policy to do so. By carrying the sides of the Bar flush with the central portion of it, which is now advanced into the House, a sacrifice of not less than twenty seats will be involved, and after the experience of the recent debates I should be sorry to lose any seats. Your Lordships must have seen that, partly from the change in the system of proxies, and partly from the important nature of the question, the House was crowded, and there was not an inch of room which could be spared. By carrying the Benches at the Throne end of the House a little further, an equal number of seats might be gained without much inconvenience, so as to compensate this sacrifice. Even if that fifth proposal be objected to I should still urge the previous one; for in the House of Commons, before the recent change, the seats under the Gallery, though generally reserved for Peers, were very often occupied by Members of that House; and if an extension towards the Throne end be not sanctioned it would still be desirable to re-seat that space either for our own use or for the use of the House of Commons, as might, under particular circumstances, seem advisable. The sixth Resolution is, that the iron bar which now fences off the upper part of the Bar be removed. I am aware that the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees has an insuperable objection to its removal; but when the House is transacting ordinary business there is no advantage in keeping Members of the House of Commons four feet from the front of the Bar by means of this rail—and I believe that counsel are allowed at the Appeal Sittings to come up to the Bar. The last proposal is that the Reporters' Gallery be brought forward by not more than four feet. We know that that Gallery is very much crowded, and that it is extremely defective, the reporters having to discharge their duties under great difficulties. The addition of one bench would satisfy all their requirements, and would bring them somewhat further into the House, thus enabling them to hear better. Considering the indistinct tones in which speeches are sometimes delivered, and the hum of conversation which prevails, it is almost a marvel that our debates are reported with such extrordinary fidelity as they ordinarily are, and that so few inaccuracies occur, and it is desirable that we should facilitate the task by so simple and advantageous an arrangement. There are other questions which the Committee considered, and they recommended the conferring of a certain power on the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, or other Peer, that deserves consideration, but I do not bring it forward now. Another question is that of the ventilation of the House, of which we have had an opportunity of judging during the last few weeks. Your Lordships would be rather surprised if you were to watch the extremely complicated and highly scientific arrangements which exist under your feet for bringing in air, subjecting it to various processes, and returning it to the House. Complaints have recently been made on all sides, sometimes of the frigid and sometimes of the torrid zone. I do not, however, deal with that subject at present. The changes which I have explained would not, of course, make the House in any degree perfect. They are the mere minimum of those which I desire to see, but I believe they would add very considerably to the comfort of the House, and may be made without in any degree affecting the architectural effect of the building. I have no strong feeling on the subject, for these improvements fall short of those which I should desire; but as Chairman of the Committee I thought myself bound to submit them to your Lordships' consideration.

Moved to resolve,

1. That the seats in the body of the House be so re-arranged as to allow an additional interval not exceeding six inches between the second and third benches:
2. That the gangways on each side of the Treasury and front Opposition Benches be widened by six inches:
3. That the further part of the space below the Bar be screened off in accordance with paragraph IV., section 1, of the Report of the Select Committee:
4. That the sides of the Bar be carried forward four feet so as to be in a line with the present centre portion of the Bar, and that the space available be re-seated in accordance with paragraph IV., section 2, of the Report of the Select Committee:
5. That the seats sacrificed in the body of the House by the above alteration be replaced by lengthening to a corresponding extent the seats towards the Throne end of the House:
6. That the rail by which the upper part of the Bar is fenced off be removed during the ordinary business of the House:
7. That the Reporters Gallery be enlarged and brought forward by not more than four feet.—(*The Earl of Carnarvon.*)

Earl GRANVILLE: Your Lordships must, no doubt, be extremely obliged to any Member of the House who takes a great deal of trouble in any matter connected with your personal convenience. I own that I have been rather sceptical with regard to the badness of this House as to its acoustic properties. To a certain degree I am somewhat of an authority on this subject, for, in the first place, I have been a constant attendant here for twenty-three years; in the second place, I am rather deaf; and in the third place, I frequently mumble; and while I am sometimes surprised at the accuracy with which I am reported, I think I am oftener than any other Member reported to have been perfectly inaudible in the Gallery. Now, I believe it depends very much upon ourselves. When we speak out and the House chooses to listen the room performs its function perfectly. When we do not, of course it is not to be expected in any chamber that a different result should be arrived at. The room has not so much to do with the matter as has been supposed. I say that, however, with some qualification, for the noble Earl, during the whole of his interesting remarks, did not raise his voice beyond a conversational pitch, and during a considerable portion of them the House was not perfectly silent—yet I could hear without difficulty every word he said. With regard to the Committee, I am grateful to them for not having reported in favour of four changes which I think would have been objectionable. As to the first I think it would have been exceedingly inconvenient to have a smaller House for ordinary use. As to their last three proposals, I very much doubt the advantage of them. I am not sure whether the bringing of the Galleries forward would improve or deteriorate the acoustic qualities of the House. With regard to the Resolutions that have been agreed to, I may say there is no doubt that Committee was composed of Members most competent to consider the question; but it was a small Committee, and it seems that opinions were pretty equally balanced on most of the points raised. I think, therefore, the House would hardly be prepared on a question of so much detail to adopt at once all these suggestions *en bloc*. It would be much better to empower the Committee sitting at this moment with reference to arrangements proposed by the Government as to the Dining and Committee Rooms to put themselves into communication with the proper representatives of the Government with reference to some of these questions. I should deprecate acting at once in the matter. I cannot help adverting to one point with regard to the question how far the House itself is to blame. For the last few years our debates have been miserably reported: now, I think anyone who has read the Reports this year must have been struck by the immense improvement in those Reports. I believe they are in no degree inferior to the Reports of the speeches delivered in the other House, and I cannot help thinking that this very fact shows that we have laid too much blame on the construction of the House as being unfit for hearing. All these details, however, having been carefully considered by the Committee, are well worthy of consideration, and they had better be left to indirect communication with the Government than be decided at once.

EARL STANHOPE said, that he came very much to the same conclusion as his noble Friend (Earl Granville). While he thought that some of the suggestions made were practical and valuable, he doubted very much the prudence of adopting them *en bloc*. He thought that inconvenience might arise from giving space for Members of the House of Commons so far advanced into the body of the House, as it would be, by having that space advanced to the level of the front of the Bar—he thought their private conversation might be an inconvenience to the proceedings of their Lordships. He would rather suggest that the Bar should be removed to a level with the place where Members of the House of Commons now were, as this would give them room for an additional cross-Bench for the accommodation of Peers. He might add, however, that he was far from wishing to curtail the space at present allotted to Members of the House of Commons, and should be very glad if further and more convenient places could be assigned them in one of the Galleries. He admitted that upon all these suggestions there might be difference of opinion; but he would advert to one point that was not in the Resolutions, upon which there would be, he thought, a good deal of unanimity, and that was, that the state of ventilation in the House should be improved. It was a matter that eminently affected their Lordships' comfort and health. On

Monday night he never felt the heat greater in any room that he ever sat in —indeed, it seemed as if hot air were being purposely pumped into the chamber: and yet, whilst hot air prevailed above, the feet of noble Lords were exposed to currents of cold air which came in from below. He trusted some other mode of ventilation would be adopted, for on the back-Benches there had been universal complaints, and though the noble Earl opposite was disposed to treat the matter rather jocularly, it was one which seriously affected their Lordships' comfort.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he had already requested the Clerk of the Parliaments to ask the eminent gentleman who superintended the ventilation to attend the Committee next week on that subject. These difficulties of ventilation were probably greater than their Lordships in general imagined.

The Duke of MONTROSE concurred in the complaints of the ventilation. It seemed almost impossible to admit fresh air without causing a strong draught, and the cold air all came underneath the Benches, while the Bar, where during the recent debates there was a great crowd, was without ventilation. Dr. Percy, indeed, informed him that the thermometer at the door marked only sixty-three degrees; but the ventilation of the House could not be judged by thermometer in different situations, for the temperature differed very much in different parts. Dr. Percy had remarked that it was not his own scheme, and that he only did the best he could; but if he were to sit on those Benches he would soon perceive the inconvenience, and it was high time that an improvement should be effected.

The Bishop of OXFORD said, he wished to make his own addition to these tales of woe, and to call attention to the cold experienced on the Benches occupied by himself and his right rev. Brethren. He believed that this was chiefly owing to the opening of the door of the Ladies' Galleries, which closely communicated with the external air, the consequence being that not only did the light of bright eyes pour down, but also a draught of cold air enough to carry off the heads of those sitting on the right rev. Bench. It would not be surprising if this affected their speeches, and he hoped therefore that the peculiar dangers of this peculiar Bench would be taken into consideration.

The Duke of CLEVELAND complained of the cold draught to which Peers sitting below the Gangway on the Ministerial side were exposed. He hoped that when the defect pointed out by the right rev. Prelate was remedied some attention would be paid to the opposite extremity of the House.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: After what we have heard from the right rev. Prelate and the noble Duke I must say I heartily wish that I sat where those most pleasant draughts of air are felt. It appears to be one among the many advantages of supporting the Government that fresh air is supplied to their side of the House, while the unfortunate Gentlemen who sit with the Opposition are condemned to be stifled by air that must either proceed from the Styx or Phlegethon, or from the main drain of the metropolitan sewers. I have been in many buildings where bad smells were experienced, but I never felt anything like that which was experienced in this House on one of the sultry days that we have had lately. One of the difficulties in respect to ventilation is that all persons are not agreed about it —that some can stand a great deal more heat, while others can bear a great deal more fresh air than their neighbours. I do not know whether it would be possible to invent something of a glass case in which the right rev. Bench could sit where they would be free from these draughts; but I believe that the more we discourage these artificial systems of ventilation, according to which hot air must be made to descend and cold air to go up, and which send in all sorts of air where it is not wanted, and resort to the natural remedy of opening the windows, the better it will be for our general comfort.

Lord REDESDALE said, he hoped the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) would accede to the suggestion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and not press for a decision of the House on the present occasion. He was in favour of the first Resolution, but should deprecate any considerable reduction of the breadth of the table; if six inches were taken off each side that would be as much as could well be spared. With regard to sitting accommodation for their Lordships, he thought their Lordships must feel that it was smaller instead of larger than could be desired. He thought Mr. Barry's suggestion with respect to the space at the Bar was particularly good. If strangers were admitted during the debates to the space that was thrown forward for the use of counsel at the hearing of appeals, the conversation that would be carried on there might be found very inconvenient to their Lordships. He would prefer that the Bar should be left as it was, except as to the re-arrangement of the seats in it, which would be found very advantageous, whether the space there was to be given up, as at present, to the ladies, or was partially or entirely to be given up to Members of the House of Commons. He believed the architect had a great objection to bringing the Reporters' Gallery further forward. When the Gallery was thrown forward on a former occasion it was found to improve the hearing in the House. Whether by bringing it still farther forward it would be found more advantageous in regard to hearing he did not know; but if that could be done without architectural inconvenience it might be desirable.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he would like to see the Reporters' Gallery advanced and seats given on each side, and he thought the alteration would not interfere with the architectural appearance of the House or with the hearing in it. He bore his testimony to the horrors endured in that House during the last few days from the proceedings of the ventilation philosophers in whose power they were, and he must say, on behalf of those who occupied the Government Bench, that they did not get the benefit of those delightful currents of cool air which were said to be supplied to their supporters. He joined in deprecating those ingenious contrivances by which when the weather was cold they suffered from extreme cold, and when it was hot they suffered from extreme heat, and for his part he would much prefer that they should be relegated to the common-sense practice of ventilating by means of the windows.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he was exceedingly happy to accede to the suggestion that this matter should be referred to the Committee, as had been suggested by the noble Earl (Earl Granville.)

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—THE IRISH CHURCH BILL.—OBSERVATIONS.

EARL GRANVILLE said, it might be for the convenience of their Lordships if he stated that, as there was every reason to believe that this Bill would come up from the other House that evening, after the consideration by the Commons of their Lordships' Amendments, he proposed that the Bill in the form in which it left the other House should be printed, so as to be distributed among their Lordships to-morrow morning; and in that case, thinking it desirable for every reason that there should be as little delay as possible in the matter, he now gave notice that the Bill with the Amendments would be brought under their Lordships' consideration on Monday next.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he understood that the alterations made in the measure by the Commons were very large, and would require careful attention from their Lordships. He thought it would be exceedingly inconvenient and hardly consistent with a due sense of the importance of the subject, or even with the respect due to the other House, if their Lordships were to consider the Bill on the very next night after it came up from the Commons. They would scarcely take that course in the case of an ordinary trumpery Bill. He earnestly trusted that the noble Earl would fix Tuesday instead of Monday.

EARL GRANVILLE remarked that Monday was not the very next, but the third night after Friday.

LORD CAIRNS said, that it had at one time been thought that the House of Commons would conclude the consideration of the Amendments last night, and then it might not have been unreasonable for their Lordships to consider the Amendments on Monday. The House of Commons, however, would continue the consideration to-night, and as their Lordships' House did not meet to-morrow (Saturday), it would not be a convenient day for exchanging opinions upon the subject. He thought that it would be only respectful to the House of Commons that their Lordships should give very careful and deliberate attention to the course which they themselves should pursue when they came to consider the course which had been taken by the House of Commons. It had already gone abroad—only, however, in the ordinary channels of information, and not upon the responsibility of the Government—that Tuesday would be the earliest night upon which the Amendments of the Commons could be considered by their Lordships' House. He thought that, under the circumstances, the proper day for the consideration of the Amendments would be Tuesday. He agreed with the noble Earl that there ought to be no unnecessary delay; but it was no unnecessary delay that one day should elapse between the receiving the Bill when re-printed and taking it into consideration—for Sunday ought not to be counted.

Viscount MELVILLE was understood to recommend that the consideration of the Bill should be taken on Tuesday.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that after the expression of opinion which he had heard he would defer to their Lordships' wishes, and fix the consideration of the Bill for Tuesday.

BANKRUPTCY BILL—(No. 154.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he understood that some noble and learned Lords were anxious that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee; but he did not see any reason to think that they would not be able to dispose of the Bill satisfactorily in a Committee of the Whole House. He had been favoured with numerous Amendments, but there was only one of considerable importance, which related to compensations. There was none with respect to the principle of the Bill, and there was nothing that he saw to prevent their Lordships from going on with the Bill at once in Committee.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord ROMILLY said, he should feel very much obliged to his noble and learned Friend if he would allow the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee. It would not in the slightest degree delay the Bill. He would undertake himself to adjourn his Court for two or three days; his noble and learned Friend opposite had consented to aid him, and so had his noble and learned Friend (Lord Westbury) near him. He was quite sure that, while there would be no real delay to the progress of the Bill by referring it to a Select Committee, they would be enabled to deal with it in a much more satisfactory manner than would be possible in a Committee of the House. He regretted to say that he had a good many suggestions to make which he had not yet been able to put into the form of Amendments. His noble and learned Friend seemed to think from the fact of the Bill having been in their hands for six or seven days that there had been sufficient time to draw up Amendments; but he must remind his noble and learned Friend that he had six hours every day to spend in his Court; and he really had not been able to consider the mode of putting his Amendments into shape. He held in his hand a letter signed by six firms of solicitors of the City of London, all of the very highest eminence, and they were of opinion, with respect to Clauses 6, 7, and 11, that if the Bill passed in its present shape, any trader's credit might at any moment be utterly destroyed. There were many other points which he could mention and to which he should be desirous of calling attention in Committee, but he would reserve these matters for the Report. He earnestly hoped his noble and learned Friend would allow the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee.

Lord CAIRNS said, there was one thing for which he did not think their Lordships' House very well adapted, and that was to go through a Bill of that kind late in the evening with an attendance of from ten to twelve Members, and his noble Friend (Lord Redesdale) in the Chair with his powerful energy to dispose of Amendments. His noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack had said that the Amendments, though very numerous, were, with one exception, not very important. For himself he must say he had endeavoured to read the Bill and understand it, and there were a great many Amendments which he should wish to introduce, but of which he had not been able to give notice, sitting, as he had to do, on appeals in that House during the day, and in the evening having other business to attend to. As the noble and learned Lord (Lord Romilly) had promised to devote two or three days to the subject, he would willingly join him, because he believed the matter could be dealt with more satisfactorily in Committee than it would be in the Whole House.

Lord WESTBURY said, although he had promised the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack to do his best to avoid sending the Bill to a Select Committee, the number of the Amendments of which notice had been given, extending over fourteen pages, obliged him to come to the conclusion that the Bill could best be dealt with in a Select Committee, upon which he would be most happy to serve; and he had no doubt that in the course of three days the Committee would arrive at very satisfactory conclusions. He would do nothing to imperil the Bill, but its provisions were of very great importance, and required to be carefully considered. He was delighted to find that one of the main features of this Bill was the appointment of a Chief Judge in Bankruptcy—an arrangement he had always advocated, and, indeed, had incorporated in his Bill of 1861; but when that proposal was struck out of that Bill its vital principle was gone, and on this account he objected to the enactment being described by his name.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, that the present proposal for the appointment of a Chief Judge in connection with all existing machinery of the Bankruptcy Law was a very different thing from the proposition of his noble and learned Friend's Bill to abolish the Commissioners and appoint a Chief Judge in their stead. He agreed in the desirability of referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

The LORD CHANCELLOR feared that a reference of the Bill to a Select Committee would cause it to be postponed to another Session. This would be greatly regretted by an immense number of mercantile men, who did not wish to see in another year that 6,500 bankruptcies out of 9,000 should yield no dividend. During the afternoon he had been waited on by a large deputation, representing thirty-seven Chambers of Commerce, most earnestly praying that the Bill should pass this Session. Their Petition he had already presented to their Lordships' House. Besides this, the Bill had been considered in the other House by a number of Gentlemen eminent as barristers, solicitors, and mercantile men, who sat day after day in Committee of the Whole House; and, surely, if this could be done in the other House of Parliament, their Lordships could consider the Bill in Committee of the Whole House, especially as that Committee would be more select than the Committee of the House of Commons.

Lord ROMILLY then *moved* an Amendment to leave out all the words after ("That") and insert ("the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.")

On Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Negative*. Bill *referred* to a Select Committee accordingly; The Committee to be named on *Monday* next.

And, on Monday, July 19, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—

Ld. Chancellor.	L. Westbury.
Ld. Privy Seal.	L. Romilly.
V. Halifax.	L. Colonsay.
L. Overstone.	L. Cairns.
L. Belper.	L. Penzance.
L. Chelmsford.	

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT BILL.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read, and *discharged;* and Bill *referred* to the Select Committee on the Bankruptcy Bill.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House *resumed.*

IRISH CHURCH BILL.

Returned from the Commons with several of the amendments made by the Lords *agreed to;* several amendments *agreed to*, with amendments; and several other amendments *disagreed to*, for which they assign Reasons: The said Reasons, and Bill, with the amendments, to be *printed;* and to be taken into consideration on *Tuesday* next. (Nos. 196 and 197.)

House adjourned at a quarter past One o'clock, A.M., till Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 16*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—Fortifications [Provision for Expenses]; Basses Lights (Ceylon).

Second Reading — Telegraph* [197]; Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks* [184].

Committee — Report — Railways Abandonment* [186-219]; Jamaica Loans* [200]; Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment* [94-220].

Considered as amended — Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* [173].

Lords' Amendments further Considered—Irish Church [209].

Withdrawn—Trade Marks Registration* [126]; Party Processions (Ireland)* [6].

TURKEY—CHRISTIANS IN CRETE.

QUESTION.

MR. SERJEANT DOWSE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any steps are at present being taken by the Turkish Government to secure to the Christians in Crete those civil and religious rights, the enjoyment of which has been so frequently promised by the Turkish Government to its Christian subjects since the Crimean War?

MR. OTWAY replied, that the Porte had taken steps to secure those rights to the Christians of Crete by the introduction into the island, since the termination of the insurrection, of the Vilazet system of administration. Under that system a General Assembly was elected, whose duty it was to apportion between the governments into which the island was divided the amount of direct taxes to be raised; to regulate the collection of indirect taxes, to control the general revenue and expenditure, and to discuss measures of administration. The first Session of that body had just been held. Her Majesty's Consul reported that the elections had been conducted with perfect order and fairness, not a single complaint of interference on the part of the authorities having been made; but that it would only be by experience that any correct opinion as to the working of that system of administration could be formed. Local Councils, with functions of a corresponding character, were elected for each of the governments into which the island was divided. The composition of the General Assembly and of the Local Councils was as follows:—Delegates in equal numbers, Christians and Mussulmans, were elected by the inhabitants professing the two religions in mixed districts; and Christians alone were elected in districts only inhabited by Christians. All measures of a repressive nature adopted during the insurrection seemed to have been withdrawn; the refugees had continued to return in large numbers; a general disarmament had been quietly effected; and the Porte had granted the same sum that was formerly given towards the maintenance of Christian schools. A general measure of education would probably be adopted as soon as duly qualified teachers could be obtained.

PARLIAMENT—LADIES' GALLERY.

QUESTION.

MR. H. A. HERBERT said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Why gentlemen should be admitted into the Strangers' Gallery before prayers, the ladies being obliged to sit on the staircase or stand about in the passage outside their gallery till after the House is made; and, whether, if it is essential to continue this practice, he will have seats placed outside for their accommodation?

MR. LAYARD, in reply, said, he had already stated to the House that he had been a witness, on the previous day, of the painful state of things described in his hon. Friend's Question. He could, however, scarcely do anything in the way of affording greater convenience to the ladies visiting the Gallery allotted for their use. That could certainly not be done by opening the door earlier, because the ladies would come down sooner for the purpose of securing front seats, and the same state of things as at present would continue to exist. So far as a waiting room was concerned he would merely observe that there was no place in which chairs could be put for ladies to sit down. The only suggestion he had to make in connection with the matter was one which it depended on the Serjeant-at-Arms to carry into effect, and that was that in future when Members balloted for admission for ladies to the Gallery they should receive a number corresponding with the number of the chair assigned to them. If that were done ladies need not come down to the House before the debates commenced, and they would not suffer the inconvenience to which they were now exposed.

IRISH CHURCH BILL.—[BILL 209.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *further considered.*

Amendment to leave out Clause 29, read a second time, and *agreed to.*

MR. GLADSTONE: I believe, Sir, there is no Amendment on Clause 28, and therefore we come now to that part of the Bill which relates to private endowments and the Royal Grants of Ulster glebes; and on this point I have to say that we assent to the omission of Clauses 29 and 30 as they stood in our Bill, the former relating to private endowments, and the latter, supplementary to it, relating to mixed endowments. The Lords have inserted a clause which stands now as Clause C, as follows:—It consists of two paragraphs. The first paragraph grants to the representative body of the said Church, in respect of private endowments, within six calendar months after the first day of May—I move, of course, to substitute January—1871, the sum of £500,000. I think it right to point out to the House the effect of this change. When I originally estimated the value of private endowments at £500,000, I referred to their actual value in themselves, and took no account of the fact that they are for the present charged with life interests. The present value of the private endowments is very little more than half of £500,000, even if they are worth as much. I am aware that our estimate has been grievously impugned, and we have been told that they are not worth more than £200,000. Our estimate is one made in good faith, and we believe it to be the more correct; but I think it right the House should understand that we are now making a considerable concession, and one which we should not have thought it right to make except for important considerations, in converting the prospective value of these private endowments—namely, £500,000—into an actual payment of that amount after the 1st of January, 1871. The advantages which we think are to be gained by this method of proceeding are, in the first place, the getting rid of a considerable expense, as well as of a great deal of labour, possibly of litigation, in ascertaining these private endowments. Still it is a very considerable boon that we offer to the Established Church, and in offering it I cannot pretend that we in the slightest degree recede from the ground we took up in reference to private endowments before 1660. Private endowments before 1550 there were in plenty, but nobody has yet produced a single one made between 1550 and 1660. You may find plenty obtained by Strafford through the Court of High Commission, when the boot and the thumb-screw were in prospect; and people were pretty well aware from what was passing in England that if they did not accede to what was demanded they might leave that presence with ears considerably abridged from their length when they entered. ["Oh!"] The humanity of the hon. Member may be shocked at hearing this; but he would be still more shocked, I think, in reading the history of those days, when Mr. Leighton, the father of the Archbishop, suffered with other persons in the particular manner I have described. I do not wish to say more on this subject, except to say that we must not be understood as making any admission when we ask the House to accede to this Amendment and grant the sum I have named in respect of private endowments. In our minds, however, this ready-money payment has always been associated with this result—that it would be the means of closing the whole controversy with respect to the Royal glebes. As I understood the argument used on the other side upon this topic, it was that these glebes being at the disposal of the Sovereign, and being by him granted to the Church, ought to be considered as private endowments. That is the ground upon which we venture to found what we hope will be considered on the other side as a conciliatory recommendation, and my Motion, therefore, will be to agree to the first paragraph of Clause C, with the single exception of substituting January for May, and to disagree to the second paragraph, by which the Royal Grants are conferred upon the Church in Ireland—grants which, in our view, are as clearly portions of public endowment as any portions of the present property of the Church.

To insert Clause C, the next Amendment.

First paragraph read a second time, amended, and *agreed to*.

Second paragraph,

"When any real property becoming vested in the commissioners consists of lands which have been appropriated or granted as the glebe or glebe land of any benefice, by or in pursuance of any royal grant or letters patent since the second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the commissioners shall, on the application of the said representative body, made within six months after the first day of May one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, by order vest such property in such representative body, subject to any life interest subsisting therein,"

read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

MR. BAGWELL said, that in cases where the glebe houses had been built for the benefit of particular parishes, it seemed not quite fair that they should by-and-by go into the hands of the Church Body for the general benefit of the Church.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, when the right hon. Gentleman introduced this question to our notice in March, he estimated the value of the private endowments—even within the limitation of time proposed in the Bill—at £500,000, and the right hon. Gentleman specifically stated, if I remember rightly, that he did not include the Royal Grants of Ulster in that amount. I do not, therefore, understand the grounds on which he founds a claim to conciliation and concession by the present arrangement. We are, in fact, now reverting to the original position taken by the right hon. Gentleman, who certainly then made his estimates, assuming that there would be a limitation of time to 1660, and also that the Ulster glebes would not be considered in the case. Now, it appears to me that in considering this Amendment we ought to come to some closer understanding as to what our intentions are with regard to the future condition of the disestablished and disendowed Protestant Church in Ireland. The principle upon which the right hon. Gentleman founds the policy of the Bill is that of religious equality. But I must remind the House that in religious equality there are moral as well as pecuniary considerations. If a Church has been connected with the State for a considerable time—if she has enjoyed all the worldly advantages that such a connection brings with it—if she has been in possession of a large estate, and that estate is confiscated—if the Church is disestablished and disendowed under these circumstances, and if you destroy all the attributes which the prescription of 300 years has naturally given, I do not believe that you place a Church so humiliated and depressed in a position of equality with a Church that has not been, perhaps, established or endowed, but which, nevertheless, is in a position of triumph compared with the position of its rival. Entirely disestablished, its property wholly stripped from it, there can be no equality between such an institution and one that has never been subjected to so trying an ordeal. But we ought to look a little further into the situation. The Protestant Church of Ireland will be placed in competition with the most ancient hierarchy in Christendom, an hierarchy with a perfect organization, that organization supported by an unrivalled discipline, and that discipline depending upon the sovereign pleasure of a temporal prince. Now, I say that any Church, any ancient hierarchy planted in any land, which can command the authority and influence and support of any foreign prince is an Established Church; for establishment does not depend upon municipal arrangements, or upon the receipt of a stipend from the State. Now, a Roman Catholic Prelate in Ireland, if he feels aggrieved, can appeal to his spiritual head, who is a temporal prince, and who can and does enter, on his behalf, into diplomatic communications with the Queen of this country. That prince has establishments and subjects in every country on the globe. He has at his command the most powerful and most completely organized Foreign Office in the world—the Propaganda of Rome. He can watch and test the course of public opinion in every country. To say that the Protestant Church of Ireland, in its disestablished and disendowed state, will be in a position of religious equality with this powerful Church of Rome is a perfect mockery. It will have to contend against a Church having all the advantages of Establishment, and none of its disadvantages. Now, I think that these are considerations which ought not to be forgotten by us at this moment. What is the object of the Amendment of the Lords now under discussion, and of others in the same direction? Their object is to secure for the disestablished and disendowed Church some moderate — not adequate — but some moderate and not altogether inadequate endowment, which should, at least, particularly at the commencement of this severe trial, enable it to maintain in work the machinery that may keep its scattered congregations together. I will ask what —out of all the property of the Church, which the right hon. Gentleman has described as the richest Church in Europe —what is the amount she will retain even if all the Amendments are carried? I must say I was astonished last night that the right hon. Gentleman, in estimating the value of that which will be left to the Church, should have had recourse to the old fallacy of putting, as an item to its credit, the amount that has to be paid to the clergy in satisfaction of vested interests. The right hon. Gentleman seizes on property with a legal charge attached to it, which he is bound to pay, and in paying it, he says to us—"See what an immense property I am making you a present of!" I must confess that I never can understand the figures of the right hon. Gentleman on this question. They appear to me marvellous. He describes to us £4,000,000 that are to be obtained by the use of the public credit. One night they are placed to the credit of the Church, and the next night they are taken away from it. Then the churches are placed to its credit. First we are told that they may be reckoned at £3,000,000; a day or two afterwards we hear that they are worth nothing at all. It is a hocus-pocus of finance which I confess has baffled my powers of conception and computation. But this I do know—that, as far as we can come to any conclusion (dismissing from our minds the fallacious assumption in regard to the satisfaction of vested interests), it does not appear that, under the most favourable circumstances, the Irish Church will be in possession of an income of more than £90,000 a year. Now, considering the tremendous experiment we are subjecting that body to, I say — quite apart from all higher considerations, with which I will not now trouble the House—that is a very modest and moderate arrangement. It is, indeed, an arrangement not to be defended for a moment if the abstract principle of the right hon. Gentleman was adopted by the House. If you are prepared to say that nothing ought to be given to the Church, that is at least intelligible; but when, in making this vast revolution, the Minister himself offers a proposition, that has for its avowed object the softening of the fall of the Church, and reconciling it to the great change in its fortunes, it is not open to the House to argue the point upon abstract considerations. Now, I ask the House in deciding upon this Amendment, whether it really desires to place this unfortunate and despoiled Church in a position of unfair competition with the Roman Catholic Church, which must be its rival, and which will be, I fear, its successful rival? I hope that the House will accept this Amendment of the Lords. I am not going into the question whether the Ulster glebes were public or private endowments. I do not base my argument upon any such ground. If we enter upon investigations of that character we may split straws for ever. But I ask whether the acceptance of the Lords' Amendment would not be the most convenient and easy method of securing to the disestablished and disendowed Church of Ireland that fair and reasonable position which, even according to the principles of this measure, ought to be conceded to it? Upon that consideration I ask the House to support the Amendment of the Lords.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: As a member of the Protestant Church of Ireland, I must say one word against the argument of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli). Its meaning, if it has any, is this—that you must give these Ulster glebes to the Protestant Episcopalians of Ireland, as the only possible means of saving them from the domination of the Church of Rome. I am surprised that such a statement should come from the lips of the right hon. Gentleman, and I am sure that to the members of the Church it will appear degrading in the extreme. It is true that, in the protest against the Bill, that has been signed by several eminent Members of the House of Lords, there is one paragraph that expresses exactly the sentiments we have just heard from the right hon. Gentleman; but I was glad to see that two of the right hon. Gentleman's Colleagues in the other

House dissented from that paragraph, and that one of them was Lord Cairns. The right hon. Gentleman has said that the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is really established. I can only meet that statement by saying that he has employed the word in a misleading and unusual manner, and that he attaches to it a meaning wholly different from that which it bears all over the world. To say that a Christian Church, organized in a certain manner, and whose head resides in another country, is an Established Church is to use the term in a way totally unknown to all the world. The upshot of his argument is, as I have said, this—that without some sort of State support—without some degree of endowment, however small—it is impossible for any Church, not only in Ireland—for the argument applies universally—but everywhere, to hold its own against the Roman Catholic Church. I have no fears on this account; and if the right hon. Gentleman is haunted with them, I would refer him to a recent speech of one of his supporters, the hon. Member for Belfast (Mr. W. Johnston). Differing greatly, as I do, from that hon. Gentleman in many points, I entirely concur with him when he says that the free Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland, if it be only tolerably supported by the fidelity, zeal, and faith of its members, will have nothing to fear from any rival Church. Well, in regard to the Ulster glebes, the right hon. Gentleman tells us not to split straws. That is not a true description of the matter. The second paragraph of this clause deals with all the grants subsequent to the second year of Elizabeth, and the transfer of those grants is something more than straw-splitting. The character of the Ulster glebes is patent to all who will inquire into them. They were, in no sense of the words, private endowments, but public grants, given by the Sovereign to the Church that was intended to be—though it failed to be—the Church of the nation. If any one tells me that they were given for the purposes of Protestantism, and not to the State Church, I answer — Why were they, then, not given to the Presbyterians? Were the Presbyterians of Ireland then, or are they now, worse Protestants than the Episcopalians? As a matter of fact, was any Protestant allowed, or intended, to share in those grants unless he conformed to the dogmas and discipline of the Church of England? There can be no doubt that if we left in a Bill, professing to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church, a clause conferring on it these public grants, it would be a complete violation of the principles of the measure, and a stultification of all that we have proposed to do, or have hitherto done. When we are told that the Protestant Church cannot compete with the Roman Catholic Church, when it is disestablished, when I, as a member of the Protestant Episcopalian Church, am given that as a reason, I can only say that I protest against it and repudiate it. I should, indeed, be ashamed of that Church if she could not hold her own by the side of that other great Christian communion, the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland.

Colonel WILSON-PATTEN said, he did not know that he had ever heard a speech more disingenuously treated than that of his right hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) had been. His right hon. Friend did not say that the Protestant Church of Ireland could not compete with other Churches. The argument of his right hon. Friend was that the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland having existed for centuries in Ireland as a voluntary Church, and having assumed a position highly meritorious to itself during that period, they were now about suddenly to place the Church of England in Ireland in a position comparatively disadvantageous to it. They had made use of the Church of Ireland for 200 years for political purposes, and they were now about to take away the endowments they had granted to it, in order, as it was said, to place it on an equality with the Roman Catholic Church. He would altogether repudiate the doctrine that the Church of which he was an unworthy member could not compete with any other Communion; but it was quite a different thing to launch it under disadvantageous circumstances to compete with the Roman Catholic Church. He called on the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and the President of the Board of Trade to fulfil the engagement entered into at the last General Election. They engaged to treat this matter liberally, and they ought not to recede from that engagement; but they had receded from it. He did not think they were carrying out what the country expected from them. With regard to the general question, he must leave it in the hands of the House. He only rose to remark on the very disingenuous answer which the right hon. Gentleman (the Chief Secretary for Ireland) had given to the speech of his right hon. Friend.

Mr. WALTER said, he wished to add his protest to that which had been so ably delivered by his right hon. Friend (the Chief Secretary for Ireland) against the tone of the observations to which they had listened from the right hon. Gentleman (the Leader of the Opposition). He was bound to say that throughout the whole of this painful controversy nothing had so much grated on his ears as the language which had been systematically used by the right hon. Gentleman and his associates with reference to the position of the Irish Church. If that Church really was to be described as Job sitting in ashes and scraping itself with a potsherd, he must say he wished it better comforters than his right hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire. He had spoken of that Church as an outcast, as deprived of all the moral and political support it had received from the State, and, being so deprived, only able to maintain its position by some pecuniary contributions as equivalent for the loss of that support, and even with that support as utterly unable to compete with the Roman Catholic Church. To what did the Roman Catholic Church owe its position? Not to State support, not even to its wonderful organization. It was because it had got the support of the people of Ireland that it had increased and maintained its position. What constituted the strength of any Church? Was it the support of the State or the support of the people—of its own members? How, on the ground taken by his right hon. Friend, did he account for the fact that in three of the four provinces of Ireland, in spite of the support of the State for the last 300 years, the Church had not been able to maintain its position in Ireland? Why, did not the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) repudiate the very notion of the Irish Church being a missionary Church? What was the business of a Church but to be a missionary Church? What was it if it was not? He looked forward to a much better future for the Irish Church than some of its most boasted friends. If it showed that pluck and courage for which he gave it credit; if it showed the same courage and earnestness which the Free Church of Scotland had displayed, there must be a great future before it. He hoped and trusted it would be a missionary Church, and, if so, it might rely on receiving great support from this country. Hitherto its missionary resources had been only a few thousand pounds a year levied from this country, expended on making a few converts to Protestantism. He again repudiated the tone and language which had been used by his right hon. Friend relative to the Irish Church, as if she must give up the whole fight in despair. For himself he believed she would make use of her freedom for better purposes and with better results than had been attributed to her.

Sir FREDERICK W. HEYGATE said, it appeared to him that the question before the House was not the future of the Irish Church, but a question of justice and equity. It was whether those Ulster glebes, which he maintained, as he already had done on a former occasion, to be wholly and purely in the nature of private endowments, were to be left with the Church or not. He could not understand the arguments of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, except that he thought it necessary, in order to give a proper vigour to the Irish Church, to strip it of every penny it possessed. If ever there was a grant which was in its nature peculiarly private and local, it was the grant of the Ulster glebes. He hoped the House would observe that this was not a question of disestablishment or disendowment generally. Those grants did not apply to Bishops, deans, or great functionaries of the Church, but they were small grants attached to each individual parish in small and varying proportions —from five, and ten, to thirty acres. A great injustice would be done to individual parishes if they made them forfeit those grants. As to their amount it was very small, and if divided amongst, say, 1,200 clergymen of the disestablished Church—the present number was 1,500—would only give £18 or £20 a year to each. Was it worth while for the sake of this to quarrel with that part of the country where the usual arguments applied to the Irish Church did not apply—where congregations were large and endowments moderate? He knew that hon. Gentlemen got their idea of the Irish Church from the South and West parts of the country—from Killarney, and places like that, where they saw empty churches and comfortable parsonage houses. They came back from these places thinking that the Irish Church was a great injustice which must be abated. He maintained that the proposal of the late Government would have abated it. But if they went into the North of Ireland and insisted upon the strict letter of the law as applied to those Ulster glebes, it would be a bad policy, and one which would recoil upon themselves. The Secretary for Ireland had stated that these grants were not made for Protestant purposes; but he, on the other hand, maintained that they were made exclusively for Protestant purposes. It was the object of the Crown in those days to hold out these grants as an inducement to Englishmen and Scotchmen to settle in Ulster. They had not upon them the taint of confiscation, as having been the property of the Roman Catholic Church, but of those who had broken the laws of this country and forfeited their estates by rebellion. If the right hon. Gentleman insisted upon taking these glebes away, he would leave a sting in the Bill which it would take many years to eradicate.

Mr. M'CLURE said, he desired to say one word as an Ulster Presbyterian, on this proposition. He was not going to argue whether the Presbyterians could or could not make out any claim to these glebes, for they were not named in the clause; but he had examined into the matter, and he believed both in right and equity they would stand at least upon equal terms with the Episcopalians. He just wished to put to the hon. Members opposite from Ulster, who proclaimed themselves the representatives and protectors of Presbyterian interests, whether they would not be placing themselves entirely in a false position, if they now supported the clause in its present form. They had called upon their Presbyterian brethren to stand by them to contend in a common cause, asserting that they knew no difference between the two great Protestant churches of the country. Was all this cry of their common Protestantism to prove an empty profession? Why, he thought when that proposition was named every hon. Member from Ulster would have at once protested against its being brought forward in a form which, if they gave it their support, must preclude them from ever again addressing a Presbyterian constituency. They were demanding to have these glebes handed over solely to the Episcopal body, when that section in the district where the glebes were situated did not comprise one-third of the Protestants, and if any portion of the population of Ulster had a special right in those lands, the Presbyterians had an equal claim with the Episcopalians.

Mr. Serjeant DOWSE said, it was material to remember the issue on which hon. Gentlemen on his (the Ministerial) side of the House went to the country. For himself, as one of the representatives of an Ulster constituency, he could not, without forfeiting his private honour and his public pledges, agree to the Lords' Amendment. He would rather see the Irish Church remain as at present than accept the measure as it came down from the other House. He agreed with his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Dublin (Dr. Ball) that the Lords' Amendments must be considered as a whole; and as a whole he emphatically objected to those Amendments, but especially to the clause now under consideration; because, if it were adopted, the Irish Church would still remain a badge of conquest and of wrong. Not only would the Roman Catholics continue to be deeply aggrieved, but the Presbyterians of Ireland would also feel themselves slighted, wronged, and betrayed. So far as Ulster was concerned, the Irish Church would be left in the same position as before, with the exception of the tithes. [*A laugh.*] He would admit that this was rather a large exception, but in Ulster it would retain all the outward *indicia* of an Established Church. It would practically possess the power of the State, all the churches, the residences, and the glebe lands, which the people would remember had been wrung from the estates of their own ancestors. ["No!"] It would save hon. Members opposite some trouble if it were assumed that they differed from everything he said. To borrow a phrase from the courts of law, he would "enter their protest as read." In England, under the feudal laws, when a chief rebelled not only his own lands but the lands of those who held under him were confiscated. But in Ireland the law of tanistry prevailed. The Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel revolted against England, and broke their plighted troth. Their lands were confiscated, and all the lands of the ancient Irish septs and clans were confiscated also, as if they were held under a feudal tenure instead of being held by the law of tanistry, under which their tenure could not be affected by the revolt of their chiefs. It was sometimes supposed that King James introduced civilization into the county of Derry. But there were marks of civilization in that county before his time. The natives imported wine from Spain. [*A laugh.*] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but this was a very good test of civilization, and judged by that test hon. Members of that House would not stand very high in the scale of civilization. The natives also imported steel blades from Antwerp and Toledo, giving in exchange flax, corn, and peltries, being the skins of animals taken in the chase. The people were, in fact, an active, industrious, and intelligent race, but they had the misfortune to be Papists and Celts. A large portion of these confiscated lands was given to the clergy of the Established Church for glebes. They were given as only Kings could make presents, out of other people's property. It was curious to hear it asserted that these were not public grants, and that when the nation came in its representative capacity to re-take possession of them it should be told that by leaving them to a Church, that ought never to have had them, it would be doing a gracious and kindly act. Why, even in Ulster the Established Church was the Church of the minority. To listen to hon. Members opposite one would be led to suppose that there were no Roman Catholics in Ulster at all. The hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Conolly) stated that 300,000 Protestants were present at one meeting. Why, there were not 300,000 full-grown Protestant Episcopalians in Ireland, even if they counted himself, and a few others who were endeavouring in vain to represent Protestant Episcopalian feeling in that House. When he heard this statement he went to *Thom's Almanac*, in order that he might give the House some information on the subject. Since the time of Falstaff's men in buckram never was there such a swelling out as of these Protestant Irishmen. He found that in the county of Donegal there were 59,190 Protestants, and 178,182 Catholics, and of these 59,000 Protestants, upwards of 30,000, he believed, were Presbyterians. In the county of Derry there were 83,402 Catholics and 100,782 Protestants, of whom 80,000 belonged to the Presbyterian body. In Fermanagh, the very salt of the Protestant earth, the Protestants numbered 46,011, and the Catholics 59,751. He now came to Tyrone, his own county, and unless the Catholics there had a share in him they were not represented at all. Tyrone was represented by the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton) and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Corry), of whom he would say that he was fit to be the representative of any county, and he was sorry he could not carry the compliment further. In Tyrone there were 103,752 Protestants of all denominations, as against 134,716 Roman Catholics, making altogether 456,000 Roman Catholics against 309,000 Protestants in the four counties; and that being the state of things with regard to the relative proportions of the Roman Catholic and Protestant population in those four counties, how were the Roman Catholics and the Liberal Protestants in them represented in that House? By the hon. and, he hoped he might say, learned Member for Derry only. There was some talk about Antrim. No doubt Antrim had a large Protestant, but it also had a large Catholic population, and how was it represented? As far as its Conservative population was concerned, by its present Members; and, as far as its Liberal population was concerned, by the hon. Member for Belfast (Mr. M'Clure). Without giving any more details, he might say there were more Catholics than Protestants in Ulster. And why did he refer to these things? He did so because, if the disestablished Church were to be allowed to retain these Ulster glebes, it would be idle to tell the noble and manly population of Ulster—he said this because he believed that the northern Celt was a nobler and more manly being than the southern Celt: he did not know how the hon. Members below the Gangway accepted the proposition, but all he could say was that if the spirit of the northern Celt had influenced all the changes that had occurred in their country, perhaps Ireland need not have come up to an English Parliament to ask for a Bill of this kind—that the Church of Ireland had been disestablished. He would see that the stigma of conquest and the badge of wrong remained, and he would say—"Your Bill is a mockery and a delusion; but, as far as we are concerned, it is not a snare, because we are not so foolish as to be deluded by it." A good deal had been said about the Protestant population of Ulster, and when it suited the times the Anglican Church had endeavoured to identify itself with the Presbyterians; but what was the real state of things between those two religious communities? Why, upon the Sunday each body went to their own churches, and the Presbyterians were, in fact, as much opposed to the Anglicans as they were to the Roman Catholics. ["No!"] All he could say was that those who had sent him there were—and if the Ballot was the law of the land the hon. Member who had just spoken would never have had an opportunity of saying "No!" Just before he rose he had been speaking in the Lobby to a rev. Friend of his who had proposed him on the hustings as a fit and proper person to represent the city of Derry, because he was a humble supporter of the right hon. Gentleman who sat on the front Bench. That rev. Gentleman had since been elected the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and he had just informed him that the Presbyterians of Ireland complained as a wrong of what that House had done last night about the increase of 7 per cent in the amount to be paid on commutation. It might be said that the same thing had been done as regarded the Presbyterian Church, but it was a very different thing to receive 1*s*. in the pound upon £2 and 1*s*. in the pound upon £100. He knew in which position he would rather stand. If, in addition to this, and the £500,000 proposed to be given to the Anglicans, they were also to receive the Ulster glebes, he would rather that that Church should be left in exactly the same position as that which it now occupied, because then it would be such a monstrous wrong in the eyes of Christendom that it must sooner or later certainly be swept away, whereas in the former case the wrong would be like the baby mentioned in *Midshipman Easy*—"only a little one," and therefore likely to remain unredressed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) had prophesied a gloomy future for the Disestablished Church. He (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) believed the right hon. Member, whose genius he admired, and whose writings he had read with interest, but he was afraid with not much improvement, would prove a false prophet in this respect, as in many others. As an Irish Episcopalian, he certainly was much amused by the saying of the right hon. Gentleman last night, that after the Irish Church was disestablished it would be impossible to distinguish religious truth in Ireland. A man might just as well say that he could not tell whether he was hot or cold without a thermometer as to say that he could not tell what he believed without an Established Church to tell him. Why, what a painful position he should be placed in next year. He should be certain he held the truth at Holyhead, but as soon as he reached Kingstown he should not know whether he were a Christian or a Mahomedan. He believed that the Church would fulfil her mission with vigour and effect, disseminating her doctrines among those who would accept them, without giving offence either to Roman Catholics or Presbyterians. The result of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, when it became law in the shape in which it had left that House a month ago, would be to create in Ireland an era of religious peace and of general prosperity; and the Irish Members would speak emphatically and with one voice on Irish questions, all differences of creed and race being buried with the hateful memories of the past. He trusted one day to see Ireland, in the words of her poet, "great, glorious, and free," whether she were or no "the first flower of the earth and the first gem of the sea." When perfect accord was established between the sister countries, Ireland would prove a worthy helpmeet for England and Scotland, both countries would be strengthened, and he, for one, should not have the least fear of the future, for he was not one of those who believed in the downfall of England.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: It can hardly be a matter for regret that hon. Members, before we finally part with this Bill, should have had the advantage of hearing the very free commentary which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) has just given them upon the message of peace it was likely to convey to the great mass of the Irish people. I do not gather from what has fallen from the hon. and learned Member that it is likely the Bill will be accepted in exactly the spirit in which it was hoped by those who brought it forward that it would be received. I rise on this occasion to ask whether we really are to understand that the Protestant Church of Ireland is to be deprived of its glebes and its endowments, which it has enjoyed during the past 200 or 300 years, in a part of the country where her endowments are very moderate, on the ground that those glebes were given by the Sovereign contrary to the laws of Ireland? because if that is to be inferred, and the question of religious equality is to be put altogether on one side in favour of the view that the glebes have been taken from those who had a right to them, contrary to the law of Ireland, and in violation of the sacred law of tanistry, to which reference has been made, I am afraid that the inquiry will go much further, and that its result will be to raise expectations most inconvenient to the rights of those who now hold property in that country. We must recollect that we are told this upas tree has many branches, and that among them is that of the land question; and in dealing with that question on a future occasion we shall find that the doctrines of the hon. and learned Member will go far beyond the claims and the rights of the London Companies, and will touch the grants made to private persons in the time of James I. If the northern Celts referred to by the hon. and learned Member, with their strong and fierce organization, which he so much admires, are to be told that they are entitled to the glebes of the Established Church, because the Sovereign who conferred them had no right to them, how are you to persuade them that they are to sit calmly and tranquilly down and see the other portions of the country held upon no better title by the Saxon proprietors? In the interests of peace and conciliation I must protest against such doctrines being enunciated. If you are to call upon the Established Church of Ireland to descend from its position, and to make this great sacrifice for the peace of Ireland, let us at all events avoid doing so in the spirit which has been exhibited by the hon. and learned Member. In answer to the observation of the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), I must repeat what I have previously stated, that it is not the proper mission of the Protestant Church in Ireland to act as a proselytizing Church. My view is this—Look at this matter, if you please, with reference to the position of the Established Church as it will shortly be. Look at this question, not on abstract principles, but with reference to what would be the vital interests of that Church. What is the position of that Church, especially in Ulster? It is this—Englishmen planted a colony of Protestants in that part of the country, and gave them lands, reserving a certain portion of the lands to provide them with the means of supporting their religious worship. This has enabled them to maintain themselves and exercise their religion, without bringing themselves into collision with their Roman Catholic neighbours, and without the necessity of carrying on an aggressive religious warfare. But what do you now propose to do? You propose to turn this Church into a voluntary and, as you say, a missionary Church. And what do you mean by that? You mean to incite the men to maintain themselves by stirring up bad feeling against their Roman Catholic neighbours, and by looking for support, as the hon. Member for Berkshire has said, to contributions from voluntary societies in this country and other sources. This, however, is not the way in which we ought to look at this question. We should remember that here is a body of men who have set a good example to the people of Ireland. Here, in Ulster, we find a Protestant body who have been energetic in the development of the resources of the country, and who have set a conspicuous example of loyalty. It would be an advantage to the community that they should continue to have the benefit of a fair and proper endowment of their Church, and we ask you, on the grounds of justice to them, and of expediency, in reference to the peace and quiet of Ireland, to leave them these glebes. I think this is a concession which may fairly be made, and one which this House ought to be slow to set aside for such reasons as have been adduced by the hon. and learned Member for Derry.

Mr. CHARLEY said, this Amendment had hardly been discussed at all when brought forward in Committee; therefore, as an Irish Episcopalian, he desired to say a few words respecting it. The hon. Member for Derry (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) was always trotting himself out as an Irish Episcopalian; but the hon. and learned Gentleman only represented thirteen Irish Episcopalians, whereas he had the honour of representing 6,000 English Episcopalians. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to the hon. Member for Donegal (the Marquess of Hamilton), who, he said, represented a constituency largely composed of Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, as well as of Church people. This only showed the confidence reposed by Irish Roman Catholics and Presbyterians in Irish Churchmen. He commended the hon. Member for Derry's views on the land question to the consideration of hon. Gentlemen opposite. No doubt, when the President of the Board of Trade introduced his Bill on that subject, he would receive the support of the hon. and learned Member for Derry, who said that the Ulster glebe lands were the property, not of the King, but of the persons who possessed them before they were forfeited; the inference being that the King had no right to give them to the Church. It followed that the rightful owners were the descendants of the persons who possessed the lands before they were forfeited. Was the hon. and learned Gentleman prepared to give the lands to the descendants of these persons? If not, his argument was worthless. In order that there might be religious equality in Ireland, the other denominations must be treated in the same way in which the Church was treated under the provisions of this Bill. Every acre, and every farthing, now enjoyed by the Presbyterian and the Roman Catholic Churches must be taken from them and vested in Commissioners; the Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Churches must be subjected to the same indignities as the Church of Ireland. He could assure the junior Member for Belfast (Mr. M'Clure) that for his own part, he should be willing to give glebe lands to the Presbyterians, on condition that all the property of the Presbyterian Church should be vested in Commissioners. He entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) that, after the passing of this Bill, the Roman Catholic Church and the disendowed Church would not be upon a footing of equality. Centuries ago, according to the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, the Roman Catholic Church was disestablished and disendowed; and it followed, therefore, that, in order to establish religious equality in Ireland, the Protestant Church ought to be put on the same footing, as if she had been disestablished and disendowed centuries ago. Since the Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church had accumulated vast property; and, no doubt, the Protestant Church would likewise have done so, if she had been disestablished and disendowed centuries ago. But it was objected that this was not a private endowment. To place the two denominations on a footing of perfect equality the Protestant Church must, to a certain extent, be re-endowed. The definition given by the Prime Minister of a private endowment was, first, that it must arise from a private source; and, secondly, that it must be devoted to the Established Church, not *quâ* Established Church, but *quâ* religious denomination. The right hon. Gentleman, however, admitted that he himself violated the second part of his definition; because, in point of fact, a large portion of the property which he proposed to give back to the Church in Ireland was originally given to her as an Established Church. Why, then, did the right hon. Gentleman insist so rigidly on the first part of this definition? How did this property come to be conferred on the Established Church in Ireland? When the natives rose in rebellion, their property became forfeited to the King—not as representing the State—but as the original Lord of the fief, in which capacity the King entered into a private contract with the Protestant colonists and induced them to settle in Ireland, in consideration of his conferring these glebe lands on their clergy. As a descendant of one of those colonists, he called upon the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to advise Her Majesty to adhere to the contract entered into by her predecessor, King James I. He wished, however, before sitting down, to call attention to the fact, that they were discussing an Amendment which was not before them ; as, he apprehended, the Amendment before the House was that relating to the gift of £500,000 in lieu of all private endowments, which was quite distinct from the Amendment relating to the Ulster glebe lands.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER: I am glad, Sir, to have the opportunity of saying a few words on this clause, particularly on the first portion of it, to which the hon. Member who has just resumed his seat has alluded. I confess I cannot be entirely satisfied that we ought to deal with the private endowments, which the Bill originally proposed to reserve, on the mere footing of pounds, shillings, and pence, as far as regards the general Church Body. It may be, and I assume it is the case—because otherwise I presume the Archbishop of Canterbury would not have accepted the offer of the Government to give £500,000 for all the private endowments—that according to the best calculations the value of the private endowments which might have been saved to the Church was less than £500,000. But on this point I confess that the more or less of pecuniary value does not seem to me to be the only thing to be considered. [Mr. GLADSTONE here made a remark to the right hon. Gentleman.] I am afraid from what my right hon. Friend says that I am dealing with this subject in the dark, and without sufficient knowledge. All I was going to say may be met by some proposal intended to be made by my right hon. Friend, and if so I shall be very glad. The principle I suppose upon which the private endowments were dealt with was this. As to them the Government thought it right to put aside the strict identity of legal title with the rest of the property which depended on public endowment, and to look to the real intention of the donors of the property and to the real substantial interests of those for whose benefit it was given. If so, it would be a departure from that principle to allow the new Church Body to sell to the State the whole of these private endowments, including what individuals have given within the last few years. That would violate any idea of what is just in principle, even though it should be demonstrated that a pecuniary gain to the new Church would arise from it. Strongly as I shall sympathize with the fortunes of that Church, I could not accede to such a proposal. I shall be exceedingly glad if it should appear that the Government are going to make some proposal which would obviate that objection. As to the Ulster glebes, I have already stated my views with respect to them so fully that I think it would be inexcusable to make any prolonged observations on the subject now. But as we have heard, not for the first time, that the Bill, as it has been sent down to us from the Lords, would leave the disestablished Church in possession of a large property, I may be permitted to remark that if the Ulster glebes are refused she will not have the fee simple or any permanent interest in any property except the churches. The hon. and learned Member for Derry (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) has told us that, if these glebes are retained, the Church will keep everything with the exception of the tithes. What she really will have, in that case, is £62,464 a year, an amount which is exceeded by the private income of many gentlemen in this country. The tithes which she will lose amount to £329,087 a year, and the total of the Church property, which, except this £62,464, the nation will resume, to £581,831 a year. I must say that, whether right or wrong — and I will not now repeat my reasons for thinking it right — it seems to me to be a monstrous exaggeration to say that the keeping of so small a proportion as is now asked for would be a departure from the principle of the Bill.

MR. CONOLLY said, he could not consent to go to a division without entering his solemn protest against the proposal of the Government, which was not only a violation of the Act of Union and the prosecution of a policy of confiscation of the most odious kind in the case of the North of Ireland, but a violation of the title on which almost every holder of land in the province of Ulster held his property. If such a proposal were to be carried into effect, there was not a single man in Ulster who would consider his title to the land which he possessed as worth the paper on which it was written. Such a proposal was contrary alike to the laws of God and man, for the glebes in question had been devoted in the most solemn way by

James I. and his Ministers to the use of the inhabitants of Ulster, and confirmed to them by repeated Acts of Parliament. And who, he would ask, were the men who were returned by Ulster to represent her in that House? They were not men imbued with the wild notions of Fenianism. On the contrary, they, as well as their predecessors, had always been true to the trust which had been reposed in them, and that trust it was proposed by the Government to violate in the face of the House and the country. That was but a poor return for the past, for to Ulster that House might point with pride as being the first-born child of England.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that it was only within the last few minutes that they had got at the facts of the case, and they had to thank the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) for stating the amount of money to be dealt with under the clause. They were about to dispose of a very large portion of property, and he was astonished at the speech of the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), who said that he rejoiced at disestablishment, but considered it would not be complete without disendowment. The hon. Member said it was not only necessary to disestablish but to strip the Church of its property, in order to place it on an equality with the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome had its own organization, and Dr. Moriarty spoke of it as a great spiritual commonwealth. It was governed by one who claimed to be a prince of the Roman Catholic Church, with full power to dispose of the whole of its property. Were they so ignorant of the organization of the Church of Rome as to have forgotten the Synod of Thurles? Did they forget that it extended to the virtual disposal of things temporal as well as things spiritual? Dr. Moriarty, when asked by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in a Committee of the House—"Has not the Church of Rome a coercive jurisdiction?" replied —"Certainly." And when he was asked why that jurisdiction was not enforced, the answer was—"Because you do not send your policemen to enforce it." This brought him back to the speech of an hon. Friend, who said that the Church of Ireland would become a missionary Church. Now how did the missionaries fare in Ireland? Had not there been instances in that country when Protestant missionaries met in private grounds, of their being outraged by Roman Catholic mobs, and driven to seek shelter? Had not proofs been given that this system was extending to Scotland? And in this country it was only necessary to refer to the proceedings which had recently taken place at Birmingham. He had said before, and he now said it again, that it was not the history of Protestantism to be subdued by force. And he also said that, looking at the power of the Church of Rome, what they were now doing in Ireland in stripping the Church of her rightful property was not a message of peace, but the reverse. Were the Government denuding the Irish Church that they might protect her in her poverty? Their recent action told him they were not. If Protestants were to hold their own, they would have to hold it as they did before, *vi et armis.* If anything, the Government sided with the aggressor against Protestantism. Was it intended to lend policemen to enforce the jurisdiction claimed by the Roman Catholics? If they did so, they might expect to meet with a response from the people of England which they did not anticipate, and a response which they would be perfectly justified in making. By denuding the Irish Church of the protection she had enjoyed and of the property which was her right, he believed they were embarking in a course which would shake peace and order in this country to its foundations.

MR. HADFIELD said, that it had been decided in the other House by a majority of 7 that Roman Catholics should be endowed. Now, who composed that majority of 7? Two Archbishops of England and five Bishops. And now hon. Members were asked whether they were Protestants or not in the teeth of seven Bishops, who gave their casting votes for the endowment of the Roman Catholics out of Protestant money. Now, how did the hon. Member himself vote? Did he vote for the Amendment of the House of Lords? [Mr. NEWDEGATE: No.] No! The hon. Member skulked out of the House. Away he went, with his tail between his legs. [Mr. NEWDEGATE said he had voted against the substantive proposition.] He was speaking of the first part of the Preamble, and he would ask, was the hon. Member for Catholic endowment or not? Was he on the same side as the Bishops? Let them have no more of this. Were they, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be trifled with in that way? Had not the Bishops of this Established Church—one of them a Scotchman, another trained by a Dissenting minister — had not two Archbishops, and five Bishops, including the Right Rev. Bishop of Oxford, voted in favour of endowing Roman Catholics out of the revenues of the Protestant Church? Did not the Catholic Peers indignantly reject the proposal and vote against it? To his mind, educated, as it was his glory to have been, in the school of freedom, of emancipation from Church State endowment, there was one evil of all others which the Church had to dread and avoid, and that was endowment, and worst of all — State endowment. Of what were the people of the Episcopal denomination afraid? What were they contending for? It was not policy, it was not politics, it was not economics, it was not theology. What was it made them the forlorn hope of the Church of the kingdom? It was the want of spiritual life. They had depended upon endowments which had ruined them. Endowments ruined the Church of Rome first, and next the Reformed Church of England. Away with this accursed thing, which had tended to prostitute the Church of England and deprive her of spiritual life. There was not another denomination in the country that leaned upon endowments, except the Church of Scotland. The Nonconformists repudiated the notion of endowments; they considered endowments pernicious, that they destroyed the life of Christianity, and were the cause of bitter strife among the people. It was a sorrowful thing that one religious denomination was quarrelling in the House of Commons about endowments 200 or 300 years old, whilst all the flourishing denominations in the United Kingdom were exulting in the liberty which they enjoyed unaccompanied with endowment. He was glad to have been permitted to see the day when the Prime Minister of this great kingdom had resolved to emancipate religion from State control, and to establish it on the more permanent footing of freedom and truth.

MR. W. H. GREGORY said, he wished to bring the House back from the wide discussion they had entered upon to the question whether these Ulster glebes are to be given to the Protestant Church in Ireland. The very essence of this Bill was its strict impartiality, and this impartiality should be maintained even in small matters. In his opinion the case of concurrent endowment derived considerable strength from the easy terms on which the glebe houses were to be surrendered. He believed that the Roman Catholics would look on the retention of those glebes by the Church as an outward and visible sign of anything but an inward and spiritual grace. If it had been determined that they should be put up and sold at the death of the incumbent, the cry for concurrent endowment would never have had half its force. He therefore trusted that the Government would not give way in the smallest degree, and that, if this Bill should be lost, when it was introduced again they would treat the question of glebes and glebe houses with no more than strict justice.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND *moved*, in line 29, after the word "sterling," to insert the words—

> "But the said sum and the income thereof shall remain in the hands of the said body answerable to the trust of every such private endowment, so far as the circumstances of each particular case will permit."

The object was to supply a deficiency in the clause as it stood, and to avoid a construction which he was sure the Lords never intended that their words should be open to. It might, perhaps, be open to the donor of a private endowment to obtain a declaration that the part of the £500,000 which would come to that endowment should be applied to the purpose of the original gift, but it was objectionable that he should be exposed to that necessity, and it would be unjust if the Church Body were able to divert private endowments from their objects. Therefore, for the purpose of protecting private endowments in the locality to which they had been devoted, and of putting the £500,000 to answer the trust deeds of particular endowments, he moved the insertion of these words.

DR. BALL said, it had always been intended that the Church Body should have regard to local circumstances.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. GLADSTONE then moved that the House do disagree with the remainder of the Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 344; Noes 240: Majority 104.

AYES.

Adair, H. E.
Agar-Ellis, hn. L. G. F.
Akroyd, E.
Allen, W. S.
Amcotts, Colonel W. C.
Amory, J. H.
Anderson, G.
Anson, hon. A. H. A.
Anstruther, Sir R.
Antrobus, E.
Armitstead, G.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Backhouse, E.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baker, R. B. W.
Barclay, A. C.
Barry, A. H. S.
Bass, M. A.
Baxter, W. E.
Bazley, T.
Beaumont, Captain F.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beaumont, S. A.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bentall, E. H.
Biddulph, M.
Blake, J. A.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.
Bolckow, H. W. F.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bowring, E. A.
Brady, J.
Brand, rt. hon. H.
Brand, H. R.
Brassey, H. A.
Brassey, T.
Brewer, Dr.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Brinckman, Captain
Brocklehurst, W. C.
Brogden, A.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Bryan, G. L.
Buller, Sir E. M.
Bulwer, rt. hn. Sir H. L.
Burke, Viscount
Bury, Viscount
Buxton, C.
Callan, P.
Campbell, H.
Candlish, J.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carington, hn. Capt. W.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Carter, R. M.
Cartwright, W. C.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Cave, T.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Childers, rt.hon. H.C.E.
Cholmeley, Captain
Cholmeley, Sir M.
Clay, J.
Clement, W. J.
Clive, Colonel E.
Cogan, rt. hon. W. H. F.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Coleridge, Sir J. D.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Dalrymple, D.
D'Arcy, M. P.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Davies, R.
Davison, J. R
Delahunty, J.
De La Poer, E.
Denison, E.
Denman, hon. G.
Dent, J. D.
Devereux, R. J.
Dickinson, S. S.
Digby, K. T.
Dilke, Sir C. W
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dixon, G.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, J. G.
Downing, M'C.
Dowse, R.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dundas, F.
Edwardes, hon. Col. W.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Capt. hon. F.
Ellice, E.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J. J.
Erskine, Vice-Adm. J. E.
Esmonde, Sir J.
Ewing, H. E. C.
Eykyn, R.
Fagan, Captain
Fawcett, H.
Finnie, W.
FitzGerald, rt. hn. Lord O. A.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
FitzPatrick, rt.hn. J.W.
Fitzwilliam, hn.C.W.W.
Fletcher, I.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Fordyce, W. D.
Forster, C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fortescue, rt. hn. C. P.
Fortescue, hon. D. F.
Fothergill, R.
Fowler, W.
French, rt. hon. Col.
Gavin, Major
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J
Gourley, E. T.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Gower, Lord R.
Graham, W.
Gray, Sir J.
Gregory, W. H.
Greville, Captain
Grey, right hon. Sir G.
Grieve, J. J.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Grosvenor, Capt. R. W.
Grove, T. F.
Guest, M. J.
Hadfield, G.
Hamilton, E. W. T.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Hanmer, Sir J.
Harcourt, W.G.G.V. V.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Harris, J. D.
Hartington, Marquess of
Haviland-Burke, E.
Hay, Lord J.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Henley, Lord
Herbert, H. A.
Hoare, Sir H. A.
Hodgkinson, G.
Holms, J.
Horsman, rt. hon. E.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Howard, J.
Hughes, T.
Hughes, W. B.
Hurst, R. H.
Hutt, rt. hon. Sir W.
Hyde, Lord
Illingworth, A.
James, H.
Jardine, R.
Jessel, G.
Johnston, A.
Johnstone, Sir H.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull - Hugessen, E. H.
Layard, rt. hon. A. H.
Lambert, N. G.
Lancaster, J.
Lawrence, J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lea, T.
Leatham, E. A.
Lee, W.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lewis, J. D.
Lloyd, Sir T. D.
Loch, G.
Lorne, Marquess of
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lush, Dr.
Lusk, A.
Lyttelton, hon. C. G.
M'Arthur, W.
M'Clean, J. R.
M'Clure, T.
MacEvoy, E.
Macfie, R. A.
Mackintosh, E. W.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, D.
M'Mahon, P.
Magniac, C.
Maguire, J. F.
Maitland, Sir A.C.R. G.
Marling, S. S.
Martin, C. W.
Martin, P. W.
Matheson, A.
Matthews, H.
Melly, G.
Merry, J.
Miall, E.
Milbank, F. A.
Miller, J.
Milton, Viscount
Moncrieff, rt. hon. J.
Monk, C. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Moore, G. H.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Morrison, W.
Mundella, A. J.
Muntz, P. H.
Murphy, N. D.
Nicol, J. D.
North, F.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Conor, D. M.
O'Conor Don, The
O'Donoghue, The
Ogilvy, Sir J.
O'Loghlen, right hon. Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
O'Reilly, M. W.
O'Reilly-Dease, M.
Otway, A. J.
Palmer, J. H.
Parker, C. S.
Parry, L. Jones-
Pease, J. W.
Peel, A. W.
Pelham, Lord
Philips, R. N.
Pim, J.
Playfair, L.
Plimsoll, S.
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.

Power, J. T.
Price, W. E.
Price, W. P.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Rathbone, W.
Rebow, J. G.
Reed, C.
Richard, H.
Richards, E. M.
Robertson, D.
Roden, W. S.
Rothschild, Brn.L.N.de
Rothschild, Brn.M.A.de
Rothschild, N. M. de
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, J.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H. B.
Sartoris, E. J.
Scott, Sir W.
Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Seely, C. (Nottingham)
Shaw, R.
Shaw, W.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sherlock, D.
Sherriff, A. C.
Simeon, Sir J.
Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Smith, J. B.
Smith, T. E.
Stacpoole, W.
Stanley, hon. W. O.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stapleton, J.
Stepney, Colonel
Stevenson, J. C.
Stone, W. H.
Sullivan, rt. hon. E.
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Synan, E. J.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Taylor, P. A.
Tite, Sir W.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Torrens, R. R.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Trelawny, Sir J. S.
Trevelyan, G. O.
Verney, Sir H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vivian, hn.Capt.J.C.W.
Walter, J.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Weguelin, T. M.
West, H. W.
Westhead, J. P. B.
Whalley, G. H.
Whatman, J.
Whitbread, S.
White, hon. Captain C.
White, J.
Whitwell, J.
Whitworth, T.
Williams, W.
Williamson, Sir H.
Willyams, E. W. B.
Wingfield, Sir C.
Winterbotham, H. S. P.
Woods, H.
Young, A. W.
Young, G.

TELLERS.

Adam, W. P.
Glyn, G. G.

NOES.

Adderley, rt.hn. Sir C.B.
Allen, Major
Amphlett, R. P.
Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Arkwright, A. P.
Assheton, R.
Bagge, Sir W.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Ball, J. T.
Baring, T.
Barnett, H.
Barrington, Viscount
Barrow, W. H.
Barttelot, Colonel
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Beach, Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Bingham, Lord
Birley, H.
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bourne, Colonel
Bright, R.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brise, Colonel R.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brodrick, hon. W.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burrell, Sir P.
Butler-Johnstone, H. A.
Cameron, D.
Cartwright, F.
Cawley, C. E.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, H.
Charley, W. T.
Child, Sir S.
Clive, hon. Col. G. W.
Clowes, S. W.
Cole, hon. Col. H. A.
Collins, T.
Conolly, T.
Corbett, Colonel
Corrance, F. S.
Crichton, Viscount
Croft, Sir H. G. D.
Cross, R. A.
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Damer, Capt. Dawson-Davenport, W. B.
Dawson, R. P.
De Grey, hon. T.
Denison, C. B.
Dick, F.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, R.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Dowdeswell, W. E.
Drax, J. S. W. S. E.
Duncombe, hn. Colonel
Du Pre, C. G.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eastwick, E. B.
Eaton, H. W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, E. C.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elliot, G.
Elphinstone, Sir J.D.H.
Ewing, A. O.
Feilden, H. M.
Fellowes, E.
Fielden, J.
Figgins, J.
Finch, G. H.
Floyer, J.
Forde, Colonel
Forester, rt. hn. General
Fowler, R. N.
Gallwey, Sir W. P.
Galway, Viscount
Garlies, Lord
Gilpin, Colonel
Goldney, G.
Gore, J. R. O.
Grant, hon. Colonel J.
Graves, S. R.
Gray, Lieut.-Colonel
Gregory, G. B.
Guest, A. E.
Gurney, rt. hon. R.
Hambro, C.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, rt. hon. G.
Hardy, J.
Hardy, J. S.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Henniker-Major, hon. J. M.
Henry, J. S.
Herbert, rt. hn. General Sir P.
Hermon, E.
Hervey, Lord A. H. C.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Hick, J.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hill, A. S.
Hoare, P. M.
Hodgson, W. N.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Holt, J. M.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hornby, E. K.
Howes, E.
Hunt, rt. hon. G. W.
Hutton, J.
Ingram, H. F.M.
Jackson, R. W.
Jenkinson, Sir G. S.
Johnston, W.
Kavanagh, A M'M.
Kekewich, S. T.
Keown, W.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, hon. Colonel S.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Laird, J.
Langton, W. H. P. G.
Laslett, W.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, Lt.-Col. G. C.
Legh, W. J.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, C. P.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lindsay, hon. Col. C.
Lindsay, Colonel R. L.
Lopes, H. C.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, Colonel
Lowther, J.
Lowther, W.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Manners, Lord G. J.
March, Earl of
Maxwell, W. H.
Mellor, T. W.
Meyrick, T.
Milles, hon. G. W.
Mills, C. H.
Mitford, W. T.
Montagu, rt.hn.Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Morgan, C. O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Neville-Grenville, R.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Nicholson, W.
North, Colonel
Northcote, rt.hn.Sir S.H.
O'Neill, hon. E.
Paget, R. H.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palmer, Sir R.
Parker, Lt.-Colonel W.
Patten, rt. hn. Col. W.
Peek, H. W.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Percy, Earl
Phipps, C. P.
Powell, W.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Ridley, M. W.
Round, J.
Royston, Viscount
Salt, T.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H. J. M. D.
Scourfield, J. H.

Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Sidebottom, J.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, R.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, W. H.
Somerset, Colonel
Starkie, J. P. C.
Stopford, S. G.
Stronge, Sir J. M.
Stuart, Colonel
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Talbot, hon. R. A. J.
Taylor, rt. hon. Colonel
Tipping, W.
Tollemache, J.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Turner, C.
Turnor, E.
Vance, J.
Verner, E. W.
Verner, W.
Walker, Major G. G.
Walpole, hon. F.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Waterhouse, S.
Welby, W. E.
Wethered, T. O.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Whitmore, H.
Williams, C. H.
Williams, F. M.
Wilmot, H.
Wise, H. C.
Wright, Colonel
Winn, R.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Wynn, Sir W. W.

TELLERS.

Noel, hon. G. J.
Dyke, W. H.

Mr. GLADSTONE *moved* that the Lords' Amendment, striking out Clause 30, be agreed to.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause 32 (Limitation of right to purchase fee simple in consideration of perpetual rent).

Mr. GLADSTONE *moved* not to agree to the Lords' Amendment, substituting May for January.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that in order to facilitate the course of business, he might mention that, so far as he and those with whom he had communicated were concerned, there was no point on which he need trouble the House to divide again until they came to Clause 68, which dealt with the appropriation of the surplus. It might be convenient to the House to know that.

Motion *agreed to.*

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that in Clause 33 the Lords had acceded to an Amendment with respect to tithe rent-charge, the effect of which could not have been understood. As the clause now stood, the poor rate would be deducted from the twenty-two and a-half years' purchase if the landlord chose to buy at once, but not if he bought by way of annuity. He proposed to restore the clause to its original condition, and to disagree with the Lords' Amendment.

Motion *agreed to.*

Mr. GLADSTONE *moved* to disagree to the Lords' Amendment substituting May for January in Clause 35.

Motion *agreed to.*

Mr. GLADSTONE *moved* to agree to the remaining Amendments to the clause, and to the paragraph added to it by the Lords.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause 43 (Regulations as to appeal).

Mr. GLADSTONE *moved* to omit the words "or where the said representative body feel" and thus to leave the clause as it stood, and to enable anyone who felt aggrieved by the value set by the Commissioners on the life interests to appeal.

Agreed to.

Amendment to clauses to Clause 68 read a second time; several *agreed to;* several *disagreed to.*

Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus).

Mr. GLADSTONE: I shall move, Sir, to restore our own phraseology in line 29 of this clause. And then I shall propose to disagree with the Lords' Amendment down to the word "property" in line 37. The operative part of this clause is perfectly clear; it permits only the income of the property to be applied to the purposes described in the previous part of the clause. The previous part refers to the property without separating the income, and, therefore, I shall propose, when the proper time arrives, to insert in line 37, after the word "Act" the words "the income of such property." I shall then propose to disagree with the Lords' Amendment down to the words "lunatic asylums" in line 40, my object in stopping there being to permit my noble Friend the Member for Derbyshire (Lord George Cavendish) to move to leave out, in line 41, the words "in exoneration of the grand jury cess or other assessment in lieu thereof." I do not see that those words are essential to the clause, and therefore, as at present advised, I see no objection to their being struck out. We do not wish to bind the House at present to make a selection as to which among the objects proposed the surplus shall be applied to. I mentioned in Committee that I was not prepared to say on the part of the Government that a preference ought to be given to the case of the objects already provided for by the property of Ireland over those purposes which are entirely new; and therefore I think that it will be advantageous to accept the Amendment of my noble Friend and to strike out the words which he proposes to omit, and so to leave the matter open. Then we should propose to disagree with the Lords' Amendment down to the end of the clause, and to add the proviso or addition — that Her Majesty may by Order in Council appropriate the said property to the purposes aforesaid—

> "Before Parliament has legislated further in respect thereto, every Order in Council so appropriating the income of such property shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after the making thereof, if Parliament is then sitting, or if Parliament be not sitting, then within fourteen days after the commencement of their next session ; and such order shall not be of any validity until the expiration of forty days after the same has been so laid before both Houses of Parliament, nor shall it be of any validity at all if within such period of forty days an address be presented to Her Majesty by both Houses of Parliament praying Her Majesty to revoke such order."

In moving that proviso it is not in the slightest degree our intention to throw open the question of principle—what we ask Parliament now to decide is the principle on which these appropriations shall proceed. I stated on the introduction of the Bill that I did not believe that the clause as framed was adequate, or that any clause that could be framed would be adequate, to dispose of the whole matter, and that we should probably have to come back to Parliament for the details of the final appropriation of the surplus. Objection has been taken to the clause on the specific ground that it may lead to a wasteful method of appropriation, and it is on that ground that I have proposed to provide that, if in any case it should be found practicable and expedient to proceed by way of Order in Council, in such case the Order in Council shall be presented to both Houses of Parliament, and that it shall be open to Parliament to interpose and to arrest the operation of such Order if they shall think fit. With regard to the general principle of this clause, it was generally debated yesterday, and it may probably not be the disposition of the House to enlarge upon it on the present occasion. The principle is perfectly clear and may be briefly stated. Her Majesty's Government regard it as being of the greatest importance to the interests of Ireland that we should finally seal an absolute severance between this property and any appropriation of it for the purposes of religion. Those who recommended the postponement of the appropriation of the surplus in "another place" recommended that course with marked reference to a supposed progress of opinion in favour of an application of this money to the purposes of religion; and, although it is perfectly true that the Amendment in the Preamble was moved by a distinguished person, declaring himself opposed to this appropriation, yet he invited the portion of the House of Lords that wished for concurrent endowment to support the Amendment in the Preamble, because he said, that by doing so they would keep open the door for the purpose of raising that question of concurrent endowment. Under these circumstances, we think it of vital importance to seal and close absolutely that controversy, and we think we cannot do that without a general designation of the purposes to which, in the judgment of this House, the proceeds of the surplus should be appropriated. Indeed, when we voted upon the Preamble yesterday, I supposed we were also voting practically upon this clause —although, of course, I do not question the right of any hon. Members to raise the question—because we declared in the Preamble that this property should be applied for the relief of inevitable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or to impair certain obligations for the relief of the poor. Now, as far as legislation is concerned, the words as enacting words would be perfectly sufficient for our purpose, and therefore we are not in the least afraid of the interference of Parliament in determining upon what conditions this money shall go to reformatory schools and to the relief of the deaf, the dumb, the blind, and lunatics. What we wish to do is to record solemnly the judgment of Parliament upon the general subject, and, by the specification of a positive and substantive purpose, to prevent the revival of the baneful controversy as to the application of the surplus to purposes of religion. With regard to the specific purpose for which the surplus is to be appropriated, I have only this much to say—that, in the first place, we lay down no rule in the clause with respect to the intermediate employment of the money; that is a matter which is left entirely open to the legislative declaration which Parliament may be invited to make. It is left perfectly open to Parliament, without altering one word of the clause, to employ any portion of this money in reproductive investments — it is the income only that is to be disposed of. I think that matter is now clearly understood. The general details of the appropriation of the surplus are likely to be very long and large. I do not think it can be open to any serious doubt that in Ireland, and, indeed, in every country, there is a great mass of human suffering, for which it is desirable provision should be made, which it is far above the means of the taxation or property of the country to supply, and yet for which provision is not in any country in the world adequately supplied by the operation of the law, nay, which cannot be adequately supplied by the operation of the law, because if it were the tax would be so severe upon the independent portion of the community that the burden would be intolerable. In dealing with this point I cannot refrain from reminding the House of what has recently occurred here. We, in London, are endeavouring to make better provision for a part, and a small part only, of this suffering—that which occurs among a small portion of the pauper class — while the want to which I have referred goes far above that class; and the consequence is such an increase of the rates that it is declared, and by none more than by hon. Members opposite, that the pressure of local taxation, due to this more expansive administration, is becoming unbearable, and is sufficient to authorize grants from the Imperial Exchequer to certain districts. With regard to the various classes of persons whose cases are involved in this matter, I will refer to a few of the authorities which might be quoted upon the subject. In 1851 and in 1861 the Census Commissioners in Ireland made a careful examination of the facts, and strongly urged upon the then Government the expediency of making a national provision for the deaf, the dumb, and the blind. But does anyone suppose that such a provision could be made out of the rates or out of the county cess, or in any form be made a charge upon the property of the country? The number of the deaf and dumb in Ireland under twenty years of age, and therefore capable of education was 1,300, and the number of blind 649, making altogether 2,000 persons whose condition marked them out for assistance of this kind, and yet whose cases cannot be met by a mere increase in public taxation. It has been said that to devote this money for the relief of those persons would be a very Christian application of it, and upon that ground we are ready to defend our proposal; but of course that is not the only view that Parliament may take in dealing with this question. I do not suppose it will be denied that the Irish law upon this subject is totally insufficient. The Irish law does not agree with the law of England. I do not admit that even in England the law makes provision for this class of persons; but in England, it must be remembered, the fountain of voluntary alms has been far more widely opened than in Ireland, where it yields very scanty supplies, and where, too, the law is far more rigid than in England. In Ireland, blind, deaf, and dumb persons cannot, unless they are orphans or children of a father who is in a workhouse, be sent to be educated out of the rates; for any other father is liable to be prosecuted for desertion if any child of his becomes destitute and is relieved either in or out of any workhouse in Ireland. It must also be borne in mind that even when you provide for the education of this class it becomes a most severe burden to impose by law, for whereas the cost of maintenance in workhouses is under £8 a year, the charge required to meet the expensive wants of this class is somewhere about £20 a year. I will, however, leave the legal part of the case and the insufficiency of the present provision to be dealt with by others. I have stated the general grounds on which our proposal rests. The words in the Preamble would be sufficient for our purpose if they were enacting words; but it would be strange to allow them to remain in the Preamble, as, by a very large majority it has been decided they shall remain, and to expunge all reference to the purport of the Preamble in the enacting part of the Bill. I propose that the vote should be taken on the first Amendment, as has been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The Amendment is merely verbal, and of a formal character, but I will agree to take that vote as a decision of the whole question. I therefore move that we should disagree from the Lords' Amendment in line 29, and re-insert the words "it appears to."

MR. DISRAELI: I made that suggestion, Sir, to the right hon. Gentleman for the convenience of the House. I shall not detain the House with any lengthened observations, but merely sum up the objections entertained on this side of the House to the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman. We do not think that the views of Her Majesty's Government on this important subject are sufficiently matured, and it is our opinion that the appropriation of the surplus should be reserved. On that point, and on that point alone, I shall ask the decision of the House.

LORD GEORGE CAVENDISH said, it appeared to him that there was a variance between the words in the Preamble—which stated that property should not be relieved from any liability attaching to it—and the words in the 8th clause. He felt the more strongly that these two sets of words were at variance with each other, because the members of the family of a Relative of his who possessed considerable property in Ireland were met with no more disagreeable remark at the time of the last election than that the large landowners would derive benefit in some way out of the Church property. For his Relative and other landowners he repudiated any such notion. He should have been very glad if the rules of the House had permitted the insertion of the words which were in the Preamble.

MR. G. H. MOORE was sorry to see the attitude assumed by the Government towards some of the Lords' Amendments, amounting as it did to the submission of an ultimatum to the Estates of the Realm by the First Minister of the Crown. He did not think there ever had been an occasion when it was less necessary for a Minister to assume such a position, for that right hon. Gentleman had been supported in all the divisions upon the Bill by the unanimous and loyal confidence of the Liberal party as no Minister, perhaps, had ever been supported before. He thought that the generous confidence which had been manifested on the part of the majority of the House ought to have elicited a reciprocal spirit of confidence on the part of the Government. In particular, he thought that in the consideration of the Lords' Amendments the representatives of the Irish people ought to have been consulted, especially in regard to matters upon which the people of that country were supposed to take a deep interest. Now, all the propositions involved in the Irish Church Bill, and the greater part of its principles, were of Imperial significance, and on these every Member of the House had a right to express his opinion. Whether the Irish Church should or should not be disestablished; whether, if disestablished, it should also be disendowed; to what extent that disendowment ought to be carried; and what property should be allowed to remain with the Church under such circumstances, were all questions upon which all the Members of that House could claim to be equally interested. But when once these questions had been finally settled by large majorities, it turned out that a large surplus of money remained to be applied for the benefit of the Irish people. That the majority of that House had an undoubted right to dispose of that surplus could not be denied; yet some deference ought to have been paid to the Irish people and their representatives in a matter which so deeply affected them—namely, the application of Irish national funds to Irish purposes. That deference which he, as an Irish Member, was now asking for, he would have been willing to have extended to the representatives of the other parts of the Kingdom. If, for instance, the Established Church of Scotland were to be disendowed and disestablished, he did not believe there was an Irish Member in the House that would be governed by any other consideration than this—to allow the Scotch representatives and the Scotch people to dispose of their own funds in any way that they thought fit. The funds that were to be taken from the Church of Ireland were Irish national funds; and although the Irish representatives could not absolutely claim the right to dispose of them as they thought would best conduce to the honour and advantage of Ireland, they, at all events, had the right to say that they should not be applied in a way tending to Ireland's disadvantage and dishonour, for the purpose of propitiating the political and theological theories of any section of the population of England or Scotland. If the First Minister had thought it worth his while to learn what were the opinions of the Irish people and their representatives upon this matter he might easily have ascertained that, while they were prepared to support him in rejecting the Amendments of the Lords generally, there was one point, deeply affecting the interests of their country, on which they had a special right to be heard, and to which they wished specially to direct the attention of the First Minister. He could state confidently that out of the 105 Members returned by Ireland, there were not five —he doubted whether there was even one—who approved of the application of the surplus which was proposed by the Government. If there were five let them speak out. When he endeavoured, under rather inauspicious circumstances, to address the House on the second reading, he stated distinctly, and, as the First Minister remarked, "like a man," that while he was prepared to support the principle of the Bill, he stood aghast at the contemplation of the jobbery and waste involved in the proposed application of the surplus. He did not think then, and he did not think now, that £7,000,000 of Irish money ought to be offered up as a holocaust to the old idol of English prejudice. He believed that the time was coming when public opinion would protest against such a thing being done. Nay, more, he believed that that time had arrived, and that the great majority of the English and Irish people believed that the Government scheme for the application of the surplus was utterly absurd. No one but those who were practically acquainted with Ireland could appreciate the amount of jobbery, waste, and demoralization that would arise from the carrying out of the proposal of the Government. Here was £7,000,000 of national money belonging to one of the poorest and most neglected nations in the world to be given away for absurd purposes, when it was wanted for other and better objects. Here was a nation wanting that money as no nation had ever wanted it, and yet it was proposed to set up that £7,000,000 to be scrambled for by that class of the Irish nation whose lives were a struggle between want and jobbery, and ultimately to be absorbed into that omnivorous vortex called landed property. He protested against any such course, and he believed that the Irish people were utterly opposed to such a thing being done. The President of the Board of Trade had affected to treat this £7,000,000 as a twopenny-halfpenny affair, stating that it did not in reality amount to more than the incomes of some seven or eight landowners in this country. But it was a great deal of money to a country like Ireland, which had never been permitted to possess any property for its own national uses, and from which a large class of absentee landlords extracted enormous sums, to be expended on the banks of the Thames. The people of Ireland wished to see this money expended upon those interests which they thought needed it most. He generally found that those who were most profuse with the money of others were not the most ready when applied to contribute from their own means; and so while the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was *alieni appetens* in dealing with the funds of the Irish Church, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not found *sui profusus* when application was made to him to aid any Irish national project. That which he asked the Government to do was, not to take a step towards concurrent endowment, but a step towards the settlement of the question at issue, as public opinion might ultimately determine. Those who maintained that it would be a step towards concurrent endowment simply meant that public opinion was advancing towards such endowment, and that it was necessary to waylay it by disposing of the surplus at once. In point of fact, the spirit which was said to exist in the constituencies was nothing more than the old spirit which had so often been invoked in England. It was the same spirit which had led to the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, though it assumed a different shape; it was that spirit of intolerance which was half a lunacy and half a hypocritical swindle, which had no reliance in itself, and on which no human being could rely. They were told, indeed, that the spirit of selfish intolerance which had possessed Ireland for ages was now to be cast out; but it was only that it might enter in another form, carrying with it other spirits more wicked than itself.

Mr. W. H. GREGORY said, he recollected that when the Bill was passing through Committee he wished to propose what he regarded as a very important Amendment, but that he could only obtain a hearing by promising, watch in hand, to speak for not more than two minutes. Under those circumstances it was not strange that he should have failed to convey to the Committee the full meaning of his proposal, but he must now ask the House, taking into consideration the fact that the money about to be dealt with was essentially Irish money, not only to listen to but to be guided by the opinions of Irish Members with respect to its disposal. If the House turned a deaf ear to them on a subject so intimately connected with Irish interests, the first thing that would be said to them when they went back among their constituents was, that if they could not obtain a hearing in an English Parliament on a question exclusively affecting Ireland, they had far better for the future turn their attention to seeking to establish a Legislature at home. The moment the question of applying the surplus which would be created by the Bill to ecclesiastical purposes was disposed of, he, for one, refused to be bound by the *cy près* argument, and contended that the money should be laid out in that way which would be most conducive to the interests of the country to which it belonged. Her Majesty's Government were about to endeavour, by a series of generous measures, to bring about a better state of feeling than had formerly existed in Ireland, and this Bill would remove, it was true, what the people of Ireland looked upon as a great grievance. But there were other evils of which they had to complain. Ireland was, as compared with England and Scotland, in a very depressed condition. Let the House, under these circumstances, consider for a moment what an amount of material benefit might be conferred on her by the application of £7,000,000 of money to the promotion of some great national objects. Without mentioning any particular scheme, he might refer, for instance, to the Irish railways, the price of which was about £19,000,000. Suppose £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 were expended in connection with them, what a great benefit might be conferred upon the country in the diminution of rates and fares! But that was only one instance. There were a hundred other projects open for discussion, and which had never yet been considered. Public opinion in Ireland had never yet been brought to bear on the various views as to the best application of the surplus, and the Irish Members had been so deeply anxious to pass the Bill that they had been afraid to criticize it. He must confess that the main object which he, for instance, had in view, since the beginning of the Session, was to secure, as far as in him lay, the passing of the Irish Church Bill at any price. But now that it was in sight of port, and while he had not a single word to say against the proposed application of the money in itself, he would beg of the Government to postpone the disposal of the surplus, for a year at all events, to enable a conclusion to be arrived at as to whether there were not other modes in which it might be more beneficially applied. They might get rid of any fears of concurrent endowment by inserting words prohibiting its application in that way. At all events, the subject had not been maturely considered, and upon that ground he was justified in asking for a postponement. As to the objection made to the adoption of that course, on the ground that it would lead to quarrelling and strife, he would merely observe that the only strife which it would occasion would be those differences of opinion which must always exist among men, while it would afford an opportunity of ascertaining the real wishes of the Irish on a point which was to them of the highest importance.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, he could not refrain from expressing his total dissent from the two speeches which had just been delivered. Now that the House was approaching the end of the Session, he must say that Irish Members had no good ground whatsoever for complaining as to the courtesy which had been extended to them, or as to the manner in which Irish interests had been dealt with. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore) possessed the advantage over him of having come down to the House with a prepared oration, and it was not the first time it had occurred to him that the hon. Gentleman would not be very unwilling that the Bill should be defeated. He was not aware what section of the Irish Members had authorized the hon. Gentleman to speak on their behalf; but, speaking simply for himself and his own constituents, he would unhesitatingly state that he heartily approved the course taken by the Government, and had full confidence in their intentions with regard to the disposal of the surplus, and he believed the people of Ireland generally entertained the same feeling.

Mr. H. A. HERBERT said, it struck him, when he heard the cheers with which one or two of the speeches to which the House had just listened had been greeted by hon. Members opposite, that they were led to think there were indications of the instalment of another Cave of Adullam on the Liberal Benches. He believed, however, they would find their expectations in that respect disappointed. There might be some injustice in the Bill, but he thought it impossible to frame a measure which was more just to everyone. Taken as a whole, it was fair to the general body of the population, and would benefit the poorer classes, and that was what they wanted. It was all very well to talk of railways, but whom would railways benefit but the rich travelling classes and the shareholders in the companies? They would not benefit the poor. He, as an Irish Member, would vote in the strongest possible way for the proposal of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. MAGUIRE: Sir, I look at the question now before the House from a larger and a lesser point of view—as a matter of principle and as a matter of detail. I have listened to the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore) with great, indeed with strained attention, that I might, if possible, catch the real meaning of my hon. Friend; and, as well as I could understand my hon. Friend's meaning and intention, it seemed to me that he desired to postpone the application of the surplus with the view of ultimately accomplishing the object which he had in view, but which has been deliberately rejected by the solemn pronouncement of this House. The Irish Catholic Members have assisted the Government to carry this great measure on certain fixed principles. On behalf of the Catholics of Ireland they solemnly pledged themselves before the people of the United Kingdom to ask for nothing for their Church. This was the solemn covenant between the Catholic people of Ireland, who were making their demand for religious equality, and the people of the United Kingdom, who were to respond to that demand, and give it force and operation. Now I, as one Catholic Member, acting in the name of my Catholic constituents, will not depart even one point from that deliberately adopted covenant. The people of Ireland asked for justice not only in this matter of the Irish Church, but in other matters not less important. With regard to the Church they demanded that it should be disestablished and disendowed; but, at the same time, that the disendowment should be effected with the most scrupulous regard not merely to the feelings and even prejudices of the clergy of that Church, but to their material interests. In this spirit of fair consideration I believe this Bill has been framed; otherwise I should not have given to it the steady and uniform support which I have done. And if, in carrying out the main object and principle of this measure, I thought any one of the clauses really injurious to the spiritual life or material or essential interests of the Church, I would either have walked out of the House and not voted for it, or I would have actually opposed its proposal. My object, and I believe that of those I represent, was to do an act of justice to all, not an act of wrong to any; and this Bill, while it is an act of justice to the many, is not an act of wrong to the few. In calling on Parliament to do this act of justice, we, Irish Catholics, had no selfish interest in view, no personal motives to gratify. The objects and intentions of the Catholic body were expressed on more than one occasion, and in the most emphatic and unmistakeable manner, especially as to an endowment for their Church. Those who are fully qualified to speak as the organ of their Church — namely, the Catholic Archbishops of Ireland—but two years since, in the year 1867, solemnly re-affirmed and re-adopted the declarations which they had made on this subject for nearly three-quarters of a century,—that they were opposed to State endowments for their Church in any shape, form, manner, or degree. ["No, no!"] That, Sir, is my reading of their declarations, which were clear, distinct, and unequivocal; and I may add that, I should be ashamed of the Bishops of my Church, and I would repudiate them as my spiritual leaders—in political matters—if I believed they solemnly attached their names to what they knew to be an outrageous and deliberate sham. But, Sir, these declarations were in strict accordance with their uniform policy, and what I am certain is the feeling and policy of the great body of the Catholic people of Ireland. I, with my hon. Friend, represent a large constituency, the great majority of whom are Catholics; and on more than one occasion, but especially at the last election, I put this matter to my constituents, as other Irish Members had put it to their constituents. I put the question broadly, nakedly, and without disguise of any kind, in the spirit and even in the words in which the Catholic Bishops have spoken. That policy was approved by my constituents, and ratified by the return of my hon. Colleague (Mr. Murphy) and myself—and I stand here as the representative of that act of national abnegation. We Catholics are bound by more than this; we are bound by our own votes in this House during this and the last Session. By the solemn adoption of the Preamble of this Bill we confirmed this policy; and by the unanimous rejection of the clause proposed in the House of Lords by the Duke of Cleveland, we re-adopted this policy of generosity and self-denial; and we should now take care lest, by the postponement of the surplus, with a covert intention of its future application to the purpose which we have repeatedly and solemnly repudiated, we lay ourselves open to the charge of playing falsely with those who assist us to accomplish a great act of justice. As a Roman Catholic, I appreciate the generosity and good feeling of Protestant Members of this House, and the large and liberal spirit displayed by them in this matter of so-called, but falsely called, concurrent endowment. I appreciate the vote of the House of Lords, and the spirit in which it had its origin and much of its support; but, Sir, as a Catholic, I say it is far better to leave a voluntary Church to its own unaided exertions. I admit that in very many instances it is necessary that provision should be made for decent accommodation for the Catholic priest; and until that provision is made, there must be a marked and manifest inequality between the condition of the ministers of the two Churches. But this provision must be made by the Catholic people, not by the State. This is an object of very great importance, and one that I am happy to know has engaged the attention of the Government, who may next year bring in a Bill the nature of which has been to a certain extent shadowed forth by the hon. Baronet the Member for Londonderry (Sir Frederick Heygate)—namely, to advance money on easy terms to the Catholic inhabitants of a parish with the view of providing a decent house with a certain portion of land for their pastor, and thus place him, so far, on a fair equality with the Protestant clergyman. This, if it be called endowment, would be endowment by the people, and not endowment by the State, to which priests and people equally object. This, to which there can be no possible objection, could be done by the Catholic people of Ireland, who have done far greater things for their Church. I, Sir, am not afraid of my Church, which has never received aid, or assistance, or encouragement from the State; and I will not consent to see her degraded now in the midst of her triumphant progress. She has outlived the terrors and persecutions of evil times—she has risen above the crushing influences of the Penal Laws—she has thriven in spite of the frown and discouragement of the State; and to such a condition of strength and self-sustainment has she arrived at this moment that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) contrasts her triumphant position with that of the "fallen" "forlorn" and "humiliated" Church whose disestablishment and practical re-endowment he paints in such melancholy terms. At such a moment the Catholic Church of Ireland must not compromise its dignity or weaken its power by the acceptance of so fatal a gift as that which some would offer and others would have her accept. Now, Sir, I should wrong those who have assisted us to obtain this great victory of principle if I said that their opposition to the Duke of Cleveland's proposal was due to bigotry or fanaticism. I do not believe it to be so. For instance, in Scotland, there may exist a strong opposition to the Catholic Church; but I am persuaded that the opposition of the Presbyterian people to endowment is still stronger. Of this they have given an extraordinary example to the world, by seceding from a Church of their own doctrine and faith, and almost discipline, to establish for themselves, at great personal and national sacrifice, a Church more in accordance with their spiritual aspirations. But, however that may be, the Catholic Members adopted a certain policy in the name and on behalf of their constituents—that in this measure they would not seek for or accept anything for their Church; and they must not break faith with those from whom they ask and expect a still greater boon than the settlement of the Church question—the settlement of the land question, not upon revolutionary, but upon sound and equitable principles as between man and man. This is only a stepping stone to a greater measure. [*Ironical cheers.*] Yes, I tell my hon. Friends from the North of Ireland that I am enthusiastic in my support of this Church Bill for this among other reasons—because it will remove a cause of difference between men of different religious communions in Ireland, and because they will, by-and-by, come down to this House, instructed by their Protestant and Presbyterian constituents, to demand a settlement of that great question which appeals to the hearts and homes of the Protestants and Presbyterians of the North as well as the Catholics of the South. I do not wish my Church to touch a farthing of the revenues of the Protestant Church. The Roman Catholics demanded nothing, and have received no advantages from this Bill. [An hon. MEMBER: Maynooth.] It is not the fault of the Catholic Members that the compensation to Maynooth did not come out of the Consolidated Fund. It were better for Ireland that it had come out of the fund, for a larger surplus would have remained for general national purposes, to be applied for the benefit of all. But Maynooth is no gainer because of the particular source from which compensation is given, as in any case compensation was a matter of inevitable necessity, as to any institution from which State support was suddenly withdrawn. I repeat, then, that Catholics have not asked for and have not received any advantage for their Church in this Bill; and I would earnestly advise my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo not, by trying to postpone the application of the surplus, to hold out a temptation to the priests or the people of Ireland in the shape of ultimate concurrent endowment. [Mr. G. H. MOORE: I deny that I said anything at all with respect to concurrent endowment.] I may have been wrong in appreciating the object of the speech of my hon. Friend; but, as well as I could catch his meaning, I understood him to desire the postponement of the surplus with this view—that of awaiting the ripening and maturing of English opinion in a certain direction, so that at a future time a certain thing, of which there is no chance now, might be ultimately accomplished; and, as I understand it, it contemplates houses and glebes for the Catholic clergy. If I am wrong in this notion, I must admit my error; but to the policy involved in the proposition I am opposed, as a matter of principle, and as a matter of good faith with the Friends with whom we act. Only a night since I was speaking to a Catholic Bishop from the South of Ireland, and I asked him whether he was in favour of what is wrongly termed concurrent endowment, and he said he was directly against it. He said he was against it on principle; and that neither he, nor his priests, nor his people desired to apply one farthing of the revenues of the Protestant Church to their Church. I know this to be the feeling of the people, not only of that diocese, but of the South of Ireland, who wish to keep their clergy in as close and intimate relations to themselves as possible. Some forty-five years since the celebrated Dr. Doyle gave testimony with respect to this very question before a Committee of the other House of Parliament; and he warned Parliament of the danger of endeavouring to draw the Catholic clergy to the State, and binding them to the State by the golden link of State provision; that the more Parliament succeeded in doing so, the more they would remove the people from the State; for the moment the Catholic clergy became stipendiaries of the State in any shape, that moment they would lose the confidence of the people, and the people would thereby be the more alienated from the State. It is no slander upon my countrymen to admit that they are very liable to suspicion; and those whom I should least like them to suspect would be their clergy. When, during the late movement in Ireland, the Catholic clergy warned Fenians or Fenian sympathizers of the folly and madness of their proceedings, and tried to bring them into more constitutional tracks, some of the Fenians answered their appeals by saying—"Oh! you want to get something from the

Government." I therefore say, let the Catholic clergy keep themselves free from the shadow of suspicion; let them derive all from their people, and nothing from Parliament or the Government; but let them cherish that splendid moral influence which they exercise over their flocks for good and holy purposes, and for preserving them from the temptation of violent or revolutionary doctrines. Now, as to the surplus. My hon. Friend draws a most alarming picture of the imaginary evils which are to flow from its application to the purposes contemplated in the Bill. My hon. Friend says there will be nothing but jobbery, waste, and demoralization from the proposal of the Government. Why should this be so? Are there to be no safeguards, no defences, which could be employed to prevent jobbery, waste, and demoralization? Is it beyond the ingenuity of the administrators of this surplus to guard against these evils? As in loans under the Board of Works, or in the expenditure of any public fund, precautions can be taken against dangers of this nature, and it would be the duty of the Government to adopt such precautions. I do not attach much weight to this apprehension, and see in it no reason for postponing the decision as to the application of the surplus. Then it is asked, why not apply it to develop the national resources of Ireland? I am as anxious as any of my countrymen to promote that great object. But this is distinctly provided for; for while the income of the surplus would be applied to the purposes specified in the Bill, there is nothing to prevent the capital, or the surplus itself, from being applied to great national objects of which Parliament might approve. This has been distinctly stated by the Prime Minister; and after that statement I think the objection on the ground of its non-application to national purposes has been done away with. Then, as to the application of the income to the purposes in the Bill. It is necessary, in order to illustrate the advantage of this application, to state that in the city of Cork there are four hospitals, and they are not sufficient for the relief, not of the mere poverty-stricken, who were dealt with under the Poor Law, but of a large class who never go into a workhouse. At present the city of Cork is obliged to maintain a fever hospital at a considerable expense to the city, and at great cost to private contributors. And why is it? Because, although they have a fever hospital specially attached to the workhouse, no decent mechanic crosses its threshold. Such men will not submit to be degraded to the level of pauperism. In the city of Cork there is also a blind asylum, partly supported from the poor rate, and when a person was sent there, as a *quasi* pauper, through the Board of Guardians, only as much is paid for him as would keep him under the Poor Law; but the cost of his maintenance in the asylum is about double that amount. It is a heavy tax on the city of Cork, and it would be a humane and generous act to extend that charity as largely as possible. Again, the Upton Reformatory, nine miles from the city of Cork, although successful in its working, has not sufficient funds at command, and the assistance it will derive under that Bill would be most valuable; for the most serious difficulty is to provide means for establishing the reformed boy in some useful occupation, so as to prevent his relapse into crime. So also in the case of the lunatic asylums. In the workhouses of Ireland there are more than 2,000 lunatics or idiots. I say they ought not to be in the workhouses. This was the opinion of Lord Mayo, whose attention had been strongly attracted to this evil. The accommodation of the lunatic asylums is overstrained. The cost of the asylum in the city of Cork is nearly £100,000. It is intended for 450 inmates; it contains 600 at the present moment, and there are 100 more applicants for admission. It is said the relief proposed to be given to the county cess will go into the pockets of the landlord; but the county cess is paid by the occupier, and the great complaint is that the landlord does not pay his fair share—in fact, any portion—of this heavy burden. I do not say that the very best mode of distributing the surplus has been adopted by the Government; but I believe that, under the circumstances, a more harmless mode could not have been proposed. With regard to the question of Irish railways I maintain that the Government are bound, independently of this Bill, to deal with the question in a large and comprehensive spirit, and I, for one, will not release them from the obligation. And now, Sir, in conclusion, and addressing myself to both sides of the House, I would, without irreverence, but in all solemnity, say, in God's name let us unite to assist in passing the Bill at once and for ever, so that, if possible, this question, involving so much of religious conflict, may never again come back in any shape to the House of Commons. Let there be peace in Ireland. Let her have repose. By passing this Bill as speedily as possible the bitter feelings which it evokes will soon die down and be forgotten. I, as an Irishman, desire to see men of all denominations linked together in common sympathy, standing as it were on one common platform, and working in unison for the good of their common country. But if this Bill be postponed for another year, hate and rancour will be inflamed into fury, and Ireland will be the scene of events which every patriot and every humane man may have reason to deplore. By supporting the policy of the Government I assist the passing of this measure of justice. I do not ask for aid for my Church; I know that the principle I advocate is best suited to the independence and dignity of that Church; and in the name of those whom I now represent, I repudiate the proposal of concurrent endowment, and I would refuse its offer if it were made.

Mr. SYNAN said, he must deprecate the heat that had been imported into the discussion. The question of concurrent endowment was not involved. He was determined to support the Government upon the only issue that was really before them—the appropriation of the surplus, because not to do so would be to imperil and perhaps to defeat the Bill; but, at the same time, he did not think that the particular objects selected for the appropriation of the surplus were the best that might have been chosen, or such as the Irish people would themselves have selected. At the same time it must be remembered that the clause was not a final one. It only made provision for the application of the income, and even that would still be under the control of Parliament, which Assembly would not dare to refuse the wishes of the people of Ireland on the subject. It was a mistake to suppose that the effect of the present appropriation would be merely to relieve the county cess, and he intended to propose words for the purpose of preventing any portion of the income being employed for the relief of the Exchequer from its contribution to industrial schools in Ireland, or other matters for which it was at present chargeable; and he believed the Government would offer no objection to this alteration of the clause. He agreed in opinion with his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore); but, for the reasons he had stated, he should vote with the Government.

Sir HENRY BULWER said, he agreed with those who said that whatever was to be done on this subject should be done at once. Respecting the discussion which had arisen, it was right in a matter of this kind to listen to the opinions of Irish Members if they had any plan to propose. A plan had come down to the House of interest to Irish Members, and he had prepared himself to listen to what Irish Members might say upon that plan, and be largely guided by them; but not a single Irish Member spoke in favour of that proposition except his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. Moore), whose remarks, however, were not followed by very loud tokens of approbation. Under these circumstances, he should vote with the Government, because he understood what his right hon. Friend proposed and did not understand what the Irish Members wanted.

Mr. PIM said, he had voted with the Government on that part of the Preamble which referred to the appropriation of the surplus, and he would now again support them for the reasons which, as stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan), had induced him not to persist in the Amendment he had proposed in Committee on this clause. His right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland would recollect that, even before the Bill had been laid on the table of the House, he (Mr. Pim) had suggested to him that the appropriation of the surplus should be postponed. He was not prepared to propose any other method of appropriation, but he still objected, as he had done previously, to dealing with the surplus before they had got it. The decision now arrived at would be merely the expression of the present opinion of Parliament, and would have no effect in binding another House of Commons.

The surplus would not be realized for some years, and public opinion moved so fast in these days that even the most advanced Liberal could hardly venture to predict what would be the views of the House on this subject five years hence. Therefore, he should have preferred it if the surplus had been left unappropriated; but, under all the circumstances, he should vote with the Government. His hon. Friend the Member for Tralee (The O'Donoghue) had stated that Irish Members speaking in this discussion had always been received with courtesy and attention. That, no doubt, was that hon. Member's experience, because any man who spoke with the eloquence which characterized him would always be heard; but with those who had a more homely way of expressing themselves it was somewhat different. He himself had not spoken often on the subject, except in Committee; but when the Bill was in Committee he had attended to it very closely, and he could take some credit to himself for being the author of a greater number of adopted Amendments than any other Member who did not sit on the Treasury Bench. He had the honour of representing the most intelligent, if not the largest, constituency in Ireland. This was a most important Irish question, and if it were considered right to continue discussions until an early hour in the morning the opportunity of speaking on the subject ought to be secured to those who, representing important constituencies, were on that account entitled to a hearing.

SIR JOHN ESMONDE said, he hoped the Government would not make any concession which would interfere with the disposition of the surplus as it stood in the Bill. The proposed distribution of it had been before the Irish people since the introduction of the Bill, and no objection had been taken to it on their behalf. The best way to get at the feelings of the Irish people was to consult those of their representatives, and, if the Government afforded the House an opportunity of voting on the question whether the scheme of the Bill should be maintained intact, it would be a surprise to him if every Irish Member did not vote with the Government.

MR. W. SHAW said, he thought it rather difficult to state with confidence anything about the feelings of the Irish people, who, so far as he was aware, knew very little about the Bill. He objected to this clause as it originally stood, as a matter of business, believing it to be a crude and ill-digested clause, and he could see no reason why the Government should persist in restoring it to its first shape. When the Bill was in Committee in this House he put Amendments upon the Paper, but a whisper came to him—he believed from the Treasury Bench—that another Bill would be required to mature and carry out this clause. If so, there was not the slightest necessity for pressing it forward now. It would be quite enough to guard against the application of the surplus to any religious purpose, and that was done by the Preamble, and, if necessary, words to the same effect might be introduced into this clause. The House seemed to object to such an application of the surplus, and it was said the country did; but, without arguing the question, he would say he did not believe that the country objected to the application of the money to the provision of glebes for the clergy in Ireland. The clause made several provisions that were quite unnecessary. If there were 2,000 lunatics in workhouses in Ireland, so much the greater shame upon magistrates and guardians, for there was an Act of Parliament which empowered them to levy rates for providing the necessary accommodation; but many of these lunatics were incurable, and they were provided for as well, and much more cheaply, in the poorhouses as they would be in asylums. He further objected to the application of the funds to the relief of the landlords of Ireland, who already got quite sufficient benefit from the Bill. He did not see why the Bill should be like the laws of the Medes and Persians, and if a better application of the money could be proposed in future he did not see why the Government should not change the plan of distribution.

MR. G. GREGORY said, there was one point upon which he wished for information. The clause as it now stood was confined to the application of the income of the fund arising from the property of the disendowed Church; but nothing was said with reference to the corpus of that sum. He wished to know whether that corpus were to remain in the hands of the Commissioners, and be subjected to no control at the hands of

Parliament, the Government, or the country; and whether the Commissioners were to deal with the funds, invest them, and employ them as they liked, without any supervision? If so, he regarded the proposal as one that was in every point of view of a most objectionable character; as one that was likely to give rise to a great amount of jobbery, and lead, perhaps, ultimately, to the loss of the fund itself. In the present Commissioners, whom they knew, they could no doubt place every confidence; but, as the duties were continuous, the future Commissioners, of whom at present they knew nothing, would be beset with applications which they would find difficulty in resisting, while their proceedings would be subjected to no Parliamentary or Governmental check.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART said, he regretted that the Government were not disposed to regard with favour the proposal of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore), which not only pledged them to nothing, but which made no mention in any way of concurrent endowment. He believed the House would not do wisely in prejudging the question and deciding now what should be done with money which would not be realized for five or six years. No doubt the Government had been much influenced by the voices of the Dissenters in England and Scotland, but was it at all certain that public opinion would be the same on this question five or six years hence that it was now? They had been repeatedly told that this was a question of compromise, and many hon. Members, himself among the number, had sacrificed their individual opinions for the sake of aiding the Government on divisions. Was it quite certain that some compromise might not be needed to secure the passing of the measure in "another place?" Though he regretted the course that Her Majesty's Government had taken in the matter, he should, however, under all the circumstances, not oppose them in a division.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, like the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. Pim), spoke on one side of the question and announced his intention to vote on the other. The hon. Member for Dublin had stated that he could not understand how it was that when an hon. Gentleman like himself, representing one of the largest constituencies in Ireland, rose for the purpose of addressing the House, his observations were listened to with evident reluctance, and attributed it to what he called his "homeliness of speech." He could, however, assure the hon. Gentleman that his remarks would always be received with respect and attention if he would but speak and vote in the same sense. If the hon. Gentleman would but try the experiment, he felt certain that he would not be dissatisfied with the result. The hon. Member for Bandon (Mr. W. Shaw) had in his remarks thrown some fresh light on the question of the appropriation of the surplus. Until the speech of the hon. Member he (Lord John Manners) had remained in Cimmerian darkness as to the real intentions of Her Majesty's Government, but the hon. Gentleman had, according to his own account, received some mysterious intimation from the Treasury Bench that Her Majesty's Government intended, in another Session, to introduce fresh legislation on the subject of the surplus. Whether that information was authentic it remained for Her Majesty's Government to explain. If it were authentic, however, no stronger argument could be found for accepting the Amendment of the Lords. He confessed that darkness on this subject had not been relieved by the speeches made by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government either on that or the preceding evening. Unless his ears deceived him they had gathered last night from the right hon. Gentleman's speech that with respect to one proposal, at any rate, in the clause—that relating to industrial and reformatory schools—the objections made had been so great that the Government had been compelled to waive it. The right hon. Gentleman had also stated on the previous evening that he would propose a proviso which would enable hon. Gentlemen to object to the various schemes which might from time to time be proposed under the Orders in Council, and, if they thought fit, to propose schemes of their own. That evening the right hon. Gentleman had read the terms of the proviso, and had, in the particular affecting the deaf, the dumb, and the blind, vindicated the conduct of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had said it was of the most vital importance that the House should now decide, as they had decided in the Preamble, that not a farthing of the surplus should be devoted to purposes connected with religion in Ireland. It was, however, somewhat remarkable that the only part of the proposed distribution of the surplus which had been vindicated by the right hon. Gentleman was exactly the one which, according to Cardinal Cullen and other eminent Roman Catholic authorities, it was impossible to disassociate from the subject of religion. At the present moment Cardinal Cullen was supposed to have considerable influence with the Government; but if, unfortunately, this measure should receive the sanction of the Legislature, his Eminence would be still more powerful than at present in the management and rule of Ireland. Well, they had it on the authority of Cardinal Cullen that the education for the deaf and dumb and blind in Ireland must be a religious education. That being the case, he asked what was the position of the House at this final stage, and on this final clause of the Bill as far as the House of Commons was concerned? That House had secularized, confiscated, and diverted from its original sacred purpose property left by the piety of former ages for the service of Almighty God. And what had been the result? For the last two or three hours those on the Opposition side of the House had been the silent witnesses of a wrangle, a jangle, and a scramble among all sections of the Irish Liberal Members for the proceeds. The surplus which was to have given universal contentment and satisfaction to religionists of all shades in Ireland had already become a bone of contention before the Bill finally left that House. Not a single Irish Member had been found to rise in his place and state his conviction that the proposed appropriation of the surplus was such as would best meet the real wishes and wants of the Irish people; but the House had heard from one hon. Gentleman after another that, though they disapproved that appropriation, yet rather than vote against the Government they were content to follow the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government into the Lobby on this question. Was that the contentment that was to prevail amongst all classes of Irishmen, except those who were the subjects of the pillage and plunder? If anything could induce the House to adopt the Amentment of the Lords, it would be the scenes they had witnessed and the opinions they had heard expressed in the course of this debate. He believed that the true and wise course for the House to take would be, even at this final stage, to sanction the Amendment of the Lords.

Mr. O'REILLY said, he hoped he should gratify the noble Lord who had just sat down, and who wished to meet with an Irish Member who in his heart supported the Government distribution of the surplus. He (Mr. O'Reilly) was one who gave his vote where he gave his opinion, and he supported the scheme originally proposed because he believed it the best that could be devised. There were two questions before them—whether they ought to dispose of the surplus at once; and next, to what purposes it should be devoted. Now, he thought it was most desirable that they should decide upon what was to be done at once, not, perhaps, in all its petty details, but laying down broad lines from which they would not deviate; not attempting to bind future Parliaments, but expressing their own opinion as to the mode in which that surplus was to be dealt with. It was true the Preamble said that it was not to be applied in support of any particular religion; but they could not conceal from the speeches they had heard that there were opinions afloat, "elsewhere" more than here—though there were traces of it here too—that at some future time the question of concurrent endowment might be again revived. Now he was opposed to concurrent endowment at all times and in all modes. All the Roman Catholic Prelates with whom he was acquainted, and he was certain that the majority of the Roman Catholic people were opposed to it. They sought for their Church no share in this property. The question, then, came to be, whether the scheme of the Government for disposing of it was a good one. It was devoted originally, as the noble Lord said, to purposes of religion, and he might have added charity. As it could no longer be applied to religion they must turn to charity. There was no country in which there was greater destitution and fewer charitable endowments than in Ireland; and the people generally were so poor that there was necessity for great discrimination in the distribution of relief lest the recipients should be better off than the contributors to the poor rate. He thought that the proposed disposal for the relief of inevitable distress was a good one. In so far as the appropriation would lean in the direction of exempting land from its just obligations, it was imperfect. This applied to the lunatic asylums, but there were many objects of charity which could not be provided for by a compulsory tax. There were only two blind asylums in Ireland, and thousands of deaf and dumb were either wandering about in a destitute condition or were inmates of workhouses. On these grounds he warmly supported the proposition of the Government.

Mr. VANCE said, he considered that this disposition of the surplus was the crowning act in a measure of iniquity and injustice. The Government having utterly despoiled the Church of Ireland, were now ransacking their brains to find out some way of dissipating the spoil. Much of it was frittered away in compensation for life interests without any benefit to the Church, and it was now proposed that the rest should be devoted to objects that were already amply provided for in Ireland. A large number of institutions already existed there to accomplish the objects which this Bill contemplated, and private benevolence would be entirely dammed up in Ireland if the Bill passed without the Lords' Amendments. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) urged them to dispose of this Bill, because they would then be in a position to deal with the important question of the land. Now he (Mr. Vance) was not disposed to get this Bill out of the way in order to facilitate the hon. Member's land reforms, for he knew that those reforms meant the violation of private property. He believed the abolition of the Establishment would not tend to the pacification of Ireland. It would revive the hostility between the two religions. Agrarian outrages had increased ten-fold since the Bill was introduced, and he warned the House that when the Irish Church was destroyed, attempts upon the Churches in Wales and Scotland, and Establishments generally, would not be slow to follow.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS: I have voted silently for this Bill in all its stages; and in Committee for nearly all of its provisions. I have done so not because I regarded it as free from imperfection in detail, but because I felt that being the first practical attempt ever made to remove a great cause of trouble from the heart of Ireland, it did not behove one who sincerely sympathized in the aim and purpose of the measure to criticize nicely its subordinate features, or to run the risk of impeding its progress for the sake of minor differences of view. Hitherto, therefore, I have taken no part in the discussion that has been prolonged on this subject during the space of four months; nor should I now venture to express dissent from one particular clause of the Bill if I believed that my doing so would endanger its passing this Session. Up to last night it might be contended that there was such a danger, because it might be said that postponing the surplus might lead to future distraction and controversy regarding concurrent endowment. But we are now relieved from all embarrassment on that score. A majority of the party opposite have never concealed their repugnance to concurrent endowment, and within the last few hours the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) had advised those who were in its favour not to venture upon a division, because he was bound to tell them their cause was hopeless. On the Liberal side the whole Nonconformist section is opposed to it; the whole power of the Government is enlisted against it; and now we have nearly all the Liberal Members from Ireland declaring that the Catholic Church has not asked for it and does not want it. Concurrent endowment is dead, and will soon be buried out of sight and remembrance, whether this Bill passes or no. Then what are you afraid of? Are we to be scared by a phantom? Is it because many good men in times past, and many good men even now, in the other House and elsewhere, would have been willing to settle the question on this basis, that we are to stand here shivering and trembling now that that basis is clearly gone for ever? I remember a time in this House when such a settlement might have been carried, but it is now too late; the occasion has passed never to return. I think, on the other hand, the occasion has come when we may fearlessly and forethoughtfully grapple at once, not merely with one difficulty in Irish life, but with two: nay, when we may find it easier to deal with both together than with either separately. The Prime Minister knows that what I am now saying is no random thought, or the utterance of a man who, on a subject of great and deep perplexity, is anxious to hear the sound of his own poor voice. Before this Bill was in being, before the General Election, before the memorable Resolutions of last year were framed, I took the liberty of submitting to the right hon. Gentleman the outlines of a plan for disposing of whatever surplus there might be of Church property, and he will do me the justice to remember that it sought to embody the idea of applying the fund, not to the benefit of a particular class any more than of a particular creed, but to the benefit of the whole Irish people. The piety and patriotism of former generations heaped gifts upon the Church, intending the usufruct for the good of all. Change of times and of beliefs frustrated that design. A wealthy minority in Ireland alone belong to the Anglican Church; and Parliament has resolved that we of that communion shall no longer monopolize what was meant for the religious instruction of the whole community. Well, then, if we cannot employ Church funds for the spiritual good of all, ought we not to try and employ them in the next best way—for the physical and social, the industrial, and therefore, indirectly the political good of all? [*Cheers.*] I felt convinced before I spoke that these words would go to the heart of every just and generous man on either side of the House; and again I ask you, what are you afraid of? I do implore the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, though it be at the eleventh hour, not to lose this golden opportunity of converting the surplus fund into a great rolling stone of physical improvement and agricultural regeneration in Ireland. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Bright) thinks absenteeism so great an evil, that he would use Imperial resources to buy up estates with a view to get rid of that evil. How then can he vote for this 68th clause as it stands, which relieves every landed estate in Ireland, and therefore the estate of every absentee, from the burthen of contributing to £300,000 a year of county rate. One noble Marquess who lives all the year in Paris, is said to derive 1,000 guineas a week from his possessions in Ulster. What claim has he to share in the surplus property of the Church? yet he is one of the men to whom this surplus clause would give it. Will the President of the Board of Trade seriously argue that if you exempt occupiers without tenure from so much rate, the letting value of their holdings will not be raised? I own I have marvelled to hear hon. Gentlemen play upon words regarding this subject; for it is the veriest play upon words to call this provision of the Bill a benefaction for the suffering poor. It is no such thing; it is an undisguised benefaction to the rich; and as such I say, deliberately, it is a clause for the misappropriation of the surplus fund. Next year you will have the land question to deal with. Would it not be well to approach it with a noble fund in hand, instead of having to ask the tax-payers of England to supply you with the money? What is the land question? Broadly this, that the bulk of the tillers of the soil say they have no security of tenure, and you find infinite difficulty about satisfying them on this point. But what does this mean? Palpably, that if they now pay county rate for infirmaries and lunatic asylums they pay so much less rent, and that if that rate is paid for them out of the Church property they will pay so much more rent. Every bad landlord will be benefited, every absentee will be enriched; but the occupiers of the soil and the sick poor will not be benefited at all. Now what is the greatest of all the wants of Ireland? What is that which has baulked your best endeavours and turned the edge of your most finely-tempered instruments of good? It is the want of an independent middle class. You have here an opportunity such as you never had before, and may never have again, of creating that class. Is it not worth while trying to do so? We have heard too much, I think, of late about hustings, pledges. Personally, I am not concerned in the matter; for the only pledge I was asked to give at the last election was to vote with the Prime Minister on all important occasions, and that I peremptorily refused. But I have always felt that if a man has the courage to assert his independence of such ties, he is all the more bound by moral responsibility for the use he makes of his freedom. I can honestly say that I have endeavoured to do so; and, therefore, were the question of concurrent endowment still before us, I should vote against it, because I know that the great majority of the 32,000 electors whom I represent are opposed to such a measure. But I repeat my firm conviction that we shall hear of that question no more. In private, I have never met a man on either side of the House who was prepared to defend the 68th clause as it stands. Heretofore many were ready to acquiesce in it sooner than risk the passing of the Bill. That peril is now over, and my council therefore is to defer the appropriation of the surplus until the Prime Minister, whose inventive genius is never at fault, shall be able to mature a plan for applyiug this legitimate Irish fund to legitimate Irish uses.

Mr. KIRK said, as a member of the grand jury of Armagh and a governor of a lunatic asylum, he must contend that the application of a portion of the surplus in relief of the county cess could not particularly benefit the landlord, as he paid no cess unless he occupied the land; for it was on the occupiers, no matter to what religious communion they belonged, that the county cess fell, and they all paid the tax at the same rate. He approved the course proposed by the Government, who intended to leave the capital sum supplied by the surplus intact, and to apply the income to alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate. He cordially supported the proposal of the Government, and he trusted it would be carried.

Mr. MORRISON said, that the question of concurrent endowment had been universally condemned by the constituencies, and the speeches delivered for and against it were wide of the mark on the present occasion, as there was nothing in the clause under consideration which dealt with that matter. The House had already decided, on the Preamble, to disagree with the Lords' Amendment which went in that direction. Feeling that a golden opportunity now presented itself for applying a magnificent sum for the regeneration of Ireland, he had on a previous occasion expressed a hope that it might be expended for the purpose of popular education. He should also have been happy to go with the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. W. M. Torrens) and the President of the Board of Trade in applying the money to the practical solution of the great question of landlord and tenant, by transferring large estates when they came into the market to the hands of peasant proprietors. Last night, however, it was determined that the surplus should be applied to the relief of suffering from unavoidable calamity, and, though he thought it might have been put to a better purpose, he did not object to the money being disposed of in that way; but he did object to its being applied to the relief of the landlords and tenants in Ireland. He was sure that he was speaking the sentiments of a large number of Liberal Members when he said that in their hearts they were opposed to the manner in which it was proposed to apply the surplus, and he entreated the Government to give way on this point. No practical harm could arise from a little delay in this matter, as the first charges to be satisfied under the Bill were the compensations, and it would not be before they were paid that there could be any application of the surplus. He again entreated his right hon. Friend to give way on this point. There was a very strong feeling among Liberal Members below the Gangway that the proposed appropriation of the surplus was an improper one.

Mr. MELLY said, he must protest against any hon. Member of the House, whether sitting above or below the Gangway, rising in his place and saying that the body of independent Liberal Members—to which he had the honour to belong—were, in their hearts, opposed to the plan of appropriation as proposed by Her Majesty's Government, while at the next moment they were ready to stultify themselves by voting for the scheme. They had heard a little too much, both in the country and in the House, of the private opinions of Members on that side of the House, and they had heard too often the assertion that if hon. Gentlemen were to express their opinions frankly they would be found to be in favour of concurrent endowment. If that were the case, which he very strongly doubted, let those hon. Members to whom the observation to which he had just referred applied go into the Lobby and support the opinion they really held, instead of voting for that with which they in their hearts could not agree. He had always been opposed to the principle of concurrent endowment; and believed with the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) that endowment was the death of spiritual life; he knew it was hostile to congregational energy; and he, always therefore, opposed the reserving of the surplus, which, it was hoped by the opponents of the measure, would, at some time, be used for the purpose of such endowment. They had been told that there was a strong feeling below the Gangway that the Prime Minister ought to give way on the question now immediately under the consideration of the House; if such feelings existed they ought to be demonstrated in the usual way in the division Lobby. He merely rose for the purpose of entering his protest, but there was one other remark he would like to make. It referred to a taunt that had been continually levelled against the hon. Members who sat behind his right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone). They were taunted with having during these discussions remained silent. They had been silent because they have been satisfied. They had nothing to say, because all that it was in their hearts to utter had been more ably and more eloquently said for them, and in their name, by the Prime Minister, than it could have been said by any other hon. Member on this side of the House, and because the speeches he had made had never been refuted by hon. Members on the other side. They had followed their chief because he so nobly made good his own words and promises to them and to the country, and because he enabled them to make good theirs, and they saw no reason to regret the result.

MR. DELAHUNTY said, he had not intended to speak, but, as an Irish Roman Catholic, he had no hesitation in saying that the Roman Catholics were to a man in favour of the Leader of the House, and would not tolerate the formation of "caves" among the Liberal party. They were satisfied with the Bill which the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward, and felt humiliated as Irishmen when they heard political economists talk of working out Irish regeneration on the paltry nest egg which was found in the Bill. The hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. W. M. Torrens) should recollect that a rolling stone gathered no moss, and the only moss which he had gathered was himself. He hoped that Irish Members would as a man follow the right hon. Gentleman into the Lobby, and show that the Irish Roman Catholics were able to support their own Church. He had been returned for Waterford by a majority of persons of every religious denomination, because they believed he would not take up with the beggarly dish which the political economists would offer. He protested against the course which some *quasi* Liberal Members appeared about to take on this subject, and in which he believed they neither represented England nor Ireland. He did more—he resented the assumption that they represented Ireland. He should vote with the Government.

MR. C. DALRYMPLE said, he rose to protest against the insinuations which had been directed against Members on the Opposition side of the House, as if the vote they were about to give on this clause were dictated by some secret regard for concurrent endowment. He only wished to see the hope of extricating this large sum of money from the fantastic application to which the Government had destined it.

MR. WHALLEY said, he wished to remind the House that when last year the right hon. Gentleman now at the head of the Government was asked what he proposed to do with the surplus he was silent, and the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had then given the only legal and constitutional interpretation of that silence—that the surplus must devolve to the public service of the State. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) would yet do justice to his great reputation, and not deceive the people of England by adhering to the destination he had chosen for the surplus. Had such a destination been placed before the country at the last election the result would have been very different. He considered the scheme ridiculous, dangerous, and suspicious in the highest degree; there was no sense in it; and the proposed application of the surplus would be an apple of discord to the entire community.

MR. BRIGHT: Perhaps, Sir, before the House divides, I may be allowed to occupy its attention for some five minutes. I suspect that the House is rather tired of the prolonged discussions upon this subject. We all know that at a certain point of weariness we find great relief in temporary excitement, and possibly that may account a little for the excitement into which the House has been thrown. Now, it is making no admission which I think is against the proposition of the Government, to say that the question of the disposition of this surplus is one of some difficulty. The Government found it to be a question, and considered it to be a question, of some difficulty—not the only one in the Bill, but one that stands a little by itself. The Government, in preparing the Bill, or before, when the Bill was really in the course of formation, took the pains to make very minute inquiry as to what might be a suitable destination for the annual income arising from this fund. They had no interest in it differing from the interest of any hon. Member of this House. They certainly had no interest differing from the interest of any Irish Member, and still less had they any interest contrary to the interests and wishes of the Irish people. It has been admitted by everybody—every Englishman and every Scotchman will admit that the money is the money of the Irish people—[An hon. MEMBER: No!]—and that it ought to be applied exclusively for Irish interests. I will make no answer to any Member who objects to that; for I am sure the proposition will find a response in the reason and the heart of almost every Member of this House, as I believe it will in the heart and the head of every member of the English and Scotch community. Well, then, having no interest to do anything different from that which was the interest of Ireland—for there is no party interest whatever in this matter—the Government, after the most full and minute inquiry, arrived at the conclusion that, amidst all the variety of plans, this was the plan which was open to the very least objection. Now, I think I have a right to assume that the Government were not mistaken in this; because during these discussions, with one exception, there has been no counter plan of any kind proposed which offered the smallest chance of being received with a more general consent than the plan of the Government. That single exception is the scheme proposed in the House of Lords. That we can understand, and if I am not mistaken, the speech of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore) pointed to the same conclusion—namely, that if the opinion of the people of the United Kingdom is now against any extension of religious endowments in Ireland, possibly five years hence that opinion may change, and if the fund were left to accumulate there would be a grand opportunity for establishing, or at least for endowing, the three Churches in Ireland. That is the proposition of the House of Lords. I heard part of the debate on this question in that House, and that, I believe, was the statement made, in almost the same words, by one of the leading Members of that House. Well, but what has this House done upon this question? It has decided that whatever plan is good or bad, that is a plan which this House would not accept. I am sorry to repeat anything I have already said upon this subject, but I appeal—as I appealed last night—to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire. He knows the opinion of this side of the House; he knows the opinion of those who sit behind him; and he felt last night that it would be impossible even to divide the House on the question of further extension of endowments; and when we discussed the Preamble he took the opportunity of escaping from the difficulty which appeared to lie before him in the discussion of the Amendments of the Lords, and he told the House, and told his own party, that if this matter of the Preamble were settled, as it has been settled, it would relieve us from consideration and division upon certain other clauses which we had yet to arrive at. Everybody felt at the time, and the right hon. Gentleman knows, and we all know, that this question of difficulty that was before us was this very question of the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church. He knows, and we all know, that if from any disaster which might happen to this Bill, there was another appeal to the constituencies of the United Kingdom—I do not say that the Members on either side of the House would be greatly changed; they might be the same—but I will undertake to say that the Members on that side of the House would, if possible, be more irrevocably pledged to oppose that endowment than the Members on this side. If Gentlemen opposite went to their constituencies supporting the scheme of the House of Lords—I do not know what their numbers are now, but I will undertake to say that not one of them would require to find a seat below the Gangway, and that the portion of the House above the Gangway opposite would hold in the next Parliament the whole of the Conservative party returned in favour of that endowment. ["No, no!"] That is my opinion. Hon. Members know, speaking on this question only politically, how liberally I should have been prepared to deal with it. I am not saying it might not be politically just to make some such changes as some Members here would wish; and as the House of Lords wish, but I say, without fear of contradiction, that the opposition to the endowment of any Church is growing rapidly and steadily in this country, and I venture to say that it is quite a mistake to argue that that opinion is only to be found amongst the Nonconformist bodies. Within the limits of the Established Church the opinion against extending endowments, and against the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church, is growing and strengthening every day. And therefore I say that for the House to hold back the surplus, and to refuse the plan proposed by the Government, with the view at some future time of attempting a plan for the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, would only be to leave to the House—to the next Parliament, it may be—to the next Government, it may be — a legacy of embarrassment and difficulty that I think neither the future Government nor the future Parliament would thank us for leaving to them. What is the state of things with respect to the Irish representation. I am not accustomed to compliment parties or sections of parties in this House, but I must say that during more than twenty-five years, in which I have had a seat here, there has never been a representation from Ireland on this side of the House more honourable, more intelligent, or more patriotic, than that which we have now the honour and happiness to meet. Well, do the Irish Members tell you that the Government has been unjust or unequal? On the contrary, they have great confidence in the disposition of my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government to do what justice he can to their country. I have heard only this evening, that after an application made only very recently to the Catholic Bishops by persons who have supported the endowment scheme in the other House, the reply made by those Bishops has been that they would have nothing to do with any such proposition, and they placed full reliance and confidence in the head of the Government with regard to his general policy of justice to Ireland. Well, if that be so, if the Irish Catholic Bishops have not changed their minds, if the Irish representatives in this House support the Government almost unanimously and with great fidelity —if it is true—and there are Members sitting on those Benches who have just come from Ireland, and can tell you so—that the course taken by the Government on this question has had a wonderful effect already throughout all the Catholic portions of Ireland, in drawing the minds of the people towards the Imperial Parliament with hope and faith—I ask whether now, at this last hour, you are willing to put obstacles in the way of the passing of this Bill, and of the success of that great and honest policy which the Government have supported during the Session. And, besides what have you done with regard to the Preamble of the Bill? You have declared certain things by the Preamble, and you carried it last night by a majority of 124. You have confirmed all you had done before. That which you have done, as I believe, has been received with unanimous approbation throughout the country, and now we are asked to do that which is wholly inconsistent with that which you did last night in reference to the Preamble of the Bill. If there be any other plan, apart from that of a provision for future endowment, which the House has unanimously condemned, how comes it that no man has been able to produce a plan? If any hon. Gentleman who can find fault with this plan—and I am not one of those who would say that arguments might not be brought against it—if there be any Member of this House who has a plan as a substitute, let him bring it forward on the floor of the House, and let it be debated, and I will undertake to say that where one Member cavils at this plan, there will be twenty who will be ready to tear the new plan to pieces. The fact is—and I appeal to the House on this ground—there are questions which are very difficult, and which the House wisely leaves in the hands of the Executive Government. I undertake to say that the Administration have given more thought, and have made more inquiry too, upon this question, than any hon. Member of the House has given or made, and it is after that thought and that inquiry that this plan has been submitted to Parliament. It has been received, along with the whole of the Bill, speaking of it in the general, with an amount of acceptance by the people of the three Kingdoms which we have scarcely ever known in connection with any other great question of legislation. I ask Gentlemen on this side of the House, and I may appeal to some on the other, seeing that this new policy has been proposed and has been accepted, that they should give whatever confidence they can to the Government in this matter, believing that there are precautions taken in the Bill which will prevent any maladministration of the funds, and believing also that on the whole, probably, it is the wisest distribution of them which the Government could have chosen.

We approach now the termination of these discussions. This, I presume, is the last division we shall have to take. Let us, by as large a consent as can be obtained, by as decisive a majority as the House can give—let us conclude our deliberations on this great question, and show to all concerned in it, and especially to the people of Ireland, that we are resolved, having adopted this new policy and consented to it, that we will take the Bill as it is now offered to us, and as far as possible ensure its passing into law. I have had conversations lately with Members from Ireland, who can speak with more intimate knowledge of that country than I can, and I have the greatest satisfaction in believing that from day to day, and from hour to hour, through all those parts of Ireland where there has been the least sympathy with the Imperial Government, there is a new feeling springing up—a feeling, I will not say of confidence in the present Administration, for that were a little thing, but of confidence in the wisdom and justice of the Imperial Parliament, in our thorough and unchangeable resolution, that whether we fail or whether we succeed, we will attempt to carry out a new policy, and make Ireland, not only a close connection, but really a part of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Walpole: Sir, I had not intended to take any part in this discussion, but the address which we have just heard from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade induces me to offer a few observations on the subject now before the House. The right hon. Gentleman has just told us with the most perfect fairness—and I think no one can complain, in the least, of the way in which he has argued this question—that the particular question we have before us is not, in fact, a party question, but one upon which the House can properly give its opinion with reference to the application of the supposed surplus, after satisfying all the claims which are to be made upon it by the different religious bodies in Ireland. I venture to discuss this question in as calm a manner as I can command; and, looking upon it in the light in which the right hon. Gentleman has proposed it to the House, I wish to ask whether this appropriation of the surplus is the best that we can bind ourselves to—for that is what we are asked to do—upon the very imperfect information we possess as to the wishes and as to the feelings of the people of the United Kingdom? The right hon. Gentleman has argued this question as though it were what is called the question of concurrent endowment. I do not look upon in that light at all. I say frankly, that if it were a question of concurrent endowment there are two reasons which would induce me to vote against any such proposition which seem to me utterly unanswerable. The first of these reasons would be that I think that the property which belongs to the Church of Ireland ought to be applied to the purposes of the Church in Ireland, until it can be shown that there are no purposes for which that Church requires it. That, of course, is my individual opinion, and I do not suppose for a moment that it is likely to meet with the approval of hon. Members opposite. The second reason, however, which I have to offer against the principle of concurrent endowment is one which ought to obtain the assent of those hon. Members. We have been discussing for a long time the great subject of how we ought to deal with the question of the establishment and the endowment of the Church of Ireland, and Parliament has been induced to decide against both the continued endowment and the continued establishment of that Church, upon the ground that the national will has been declared, and that, having been so declared; it ought to be acted upon. Upon the question of concurrent endowment the national will has never been declared, but my conviction is that if it could be ascertained at the present moment, the national will would be against such a proposition. For this reason, therefore, I leave the question of concurrent endowment out of the discussion altogether. Viewing the subject in that light, it appears to me that the only propositions before us are these two—whether we shall bind ourselves now, at once and for ever—for that is the proposition of the Government—to bestow any surplus that may arise from the Church funds for the specific purposes mentioned in the 68th clause, or whether we shall reserve the consideration of this question until the time when the facts and the circumstances of the case are more fully before us than they are at this moment, and until the feelings and the opinions of the people of this country and of Ireland have been more definitely manifested with reference to the application of the surplus. I give credit to the Government for having carefully considered this matter in every point of view, and for having arrived at the conclusions they have announced upon reasons which appear perfectly satisfactory to them. A great deal may be said for them; but let me ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, and let me ask the Government, whether they have had an opportunity of ascertaining the opinions, the wishes, and the feelings of those most concerned in this matter? I very much doubt whether that is the case; and I believe that if we were to bind ourselves now and for ever to this particular application of the funds, when we are dealing with a question of immense complication, with reference to which an enormous number of questions may arise before the final settlement, we should do a thing that would not be wise. I ask, is it wise, is it prudent, for Parliament at once thus to tie up its hands, and to say—"This is the only appropriation we can make of the surplus?" Another point I am quite clear upon is this, that to apply any portion of this surplus either to the relief of the owners or the occupiers of land is certainly not the best use to which it can be put for the benefit of the people of Ireland. I can give no other vote upon this question than that which will confirm the decision come to by the House of Lords—namely, that the wisest thing that Parliament can do is to give no opinion one way or the other respecting the application of the surplus, until we have ascertained more clearly than we have at present all the claims that may be made upon that fund, and the wishes, the feelings, the principles, and the convictions of the people of the United Kingdom.

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 290; Noes 218: Majority 72.

AYES.

Acland, T. D.
Adair, H. E.
Agar-Ellis, hn. L. G. F.
Allen, W. S.
Amory, J. H.
Anderson, G.
Anson, hon. A. H A.
Anstruther, Sir R.
Armitstead, G.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Backhouse, E.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baker, R. B. W.
Barclay, A. C.
Barry, A. H. S.
Bass, M. A.
Baxter, W. E.
Bazley, T.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beaumont, S. A.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bentall, E. H.
Blake, J. A.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.
Bolckow, H. W. F.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bowring, E. A.
Brady, J.
Brand, right hon. H.
Brand, H. R.
Brassey, H. A.
Brassey, T.
Brewer, Dr.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Brinckman, Capt.
Brocklehurst, W. C.
Brogden, A.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Bryan, G. L.
Bulwer, rt. hn. Sir H. L.
Bury, Viscount
Cadogan, hon. F. W.
Campbell, H.
Candlish, J.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Carter, Mr. Alderman
Cartwright, W. C.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Cave, T.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Chambers, T.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Capt.
Cholmeley, Sir M.
Clay, J.
Clive, Col. E.
Cogan, rt. hn. W. H. F.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Coleridge, Sir J. D.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Dalrymple, D.
D'Arcy, M. P.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Davies, R.
Davison, J. R.
Delahunty, J.
Denison, E.
Denman, hon. G.
Dent, J. D.
Devereux, R. J.
Dickinson, S. S.
Digby, K. T.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dixon, G.
Dodds, J.

Dodson, J. G.
Downing, M‘C.
Dowse, R.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, F.
Edwardes, hon. Col. W.
Edwards, H.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J. J.
Erskine, Vice-Ad. J. E.
Esmonde, Sir J.
Ewing, H. E. C.
Eykyn, R.
Fagan, Captain
Finnie, W.
FitzGerald, right hon. Lord O. A.
Fitz-Patrick, rt.hn.J.W.
Fletcher, I.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C. P.
Fothergill, R.
Fowler, W.
Gavin, Major
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Gower, Lord R.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Graham, W.
Gray, Sir J.
Greville, Captain
Grieve, J. J.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Grove, T. F.
Hadfield, G.
Hanmer, Sir J.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Harris, J. D.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hay, Lord J.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Herbert, H. A.
Hodgkinson, G.
Holms, J.
Horsman, right hon. E.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Howard, J.
Hughes, T.
Hughes, W. B.
Hutt, rt. hon. Sir W.
Hyde, Lord
Illingworth, A.
James, H.
Jardine, R.
Jessel, G.
Johnston, A.
Johnstone, Sir H.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Kirk, W.
Knatchbull - Hugessen, E. H.
Layard, rt. hon. A. H.
Lambert, N. G.
Lancaster, J.
Lawrence, J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lea, T.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lewis, J. D.
Lloyd, Sir T. D.
Loch, G.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lush, Dr.
Lusk, A.
Lyttelton, hon. C. G.
M‘Arthur, W.
M‘Clure, T.
MacEvoy, E.
Macfie, R. A.
M‘Lagan, P.
M‘Laren, D.
M‘Mahon, P.
Maguire, J. F.
Marling, S. S.
Martin, P. W.
Matheson, A.
Melly, G.
Merry, J.
Miall, E.
Milbank, F. A.
Miller, J.
Milton, Viscount
Mitchell, T. A.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monk, C. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Mundella, A. J.
Muntz, P. H.
Murphy, N. D.
Nicholson, W.
Nicol, J. D.
North, F.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Conor, D. M.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Loghlen, rt. hon. Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
O'Reilly, M. W.
O'Reilly-Dease, M.
Otway, A. J.
Palmer, J. H.
Parker, C. S.
Parry, L. Jones-
Pease, J. W.
Peel, A. W.
Pelham, Lord
Philips, R. N.
Pim, J.
Playfair, L.
Plimsoll, S.
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.
Power, J. T.
Price, W. E.
Price, W. P.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, C.
Richard, H.
Richards, E. M.
Robertson, D.
Roden, W. S.
Rothschild, Brn. L. N. de
Rothschild, Brn. M. A. de
Russell, A.
Rylands, P.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H. B.
Sartoris, E. J.
Scott, Sir W.
Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Seely, C. (Nottingham)
Shaw, R.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sherlock, D.
Sherriff, A. C.
Simeon, Sir J.
Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Smith, J. B.
Stanley, hon. W. O.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stapleton, J.
Stepney, Colonel
Stevenson, J. C.
Stone, W. H.
Sullivan, rt. hon. E.
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Synan, E. J.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Taylor, P. A.
Tite, Sir W.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tollemache, J.
Torrens, R. R.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Trevelyan, G. O.
Verney, Sir H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vivian, Capt. hn. J. C. W.
Walter, J.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Weguelin, T. M.
West, H. W.
Westhead, J. P. B.
Whitbread, S.
White, hon. Capt. C.
White, J.
Whitwell, J.
Whitworth, T.
Williams, W.
Williamson, Sir H.
Wingfield, Sir C.
Winterbotham, H. S. P.
Woods, H.
Young, A. W.
Young, G.

TELLERS.

Adam, W. P.
Glyn, G. G.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hn. Sir C. B.
Akroyd, E.
Allen, Major
Amphlett, R. P.
Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Archdall, Capt. M.
Arkwright, A. P.
Assheton, R.
Bagge, Sir W.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Ball, J. T.
Barnett, H.
Barrington, Viscount
Barrow, W. H.
Barttelot, Colonel
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Birley, H.
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bourne, Colonel
Bright, R.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brise, Colonel R.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brodrick, hon. W.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burke, Viscount
Callan, P.
Cameron, D.
Cartwright, F.
Cawley, C. E.
Charley, W. T.
Clowes, S. W.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Conolly, T.
Corbett, Colonel
Corrance, F. S.
Croft, Sir H. G. D.
Cross, R. A.
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Dalway, M. R.
Damer, Capt. Dawson-
Davenport, W. B.
Dawson, R. P.
De La Poer, E.
Dick, F.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dimsdale, R.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Dowdeswell, W. E.
Duncombe, hon. Col.
Du Pre, C. G.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fawcett, H.
Feilden, H. M.
Fellowes, E.
Finch, G. H.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Floyer, J.
Forde, Colonel
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Fowler, R. N.
Gallwey, Sir W. P.
Galway, Viscount
Gilpin, Colonel
Goldney, G.
Gore, J. R. O.

Graves, S. R.
Gray, Lieut.-Colonel
Gregory, G. B.
Guest, A. E.
Gurney, rt. hon. R.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hamilton, Lord G.
Hardy, right hon. G.
Hardy, J.
Hardy, J. S.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Henniker - Major, hon. J. M.
Henry, J. S.
Herbert, right hon. Gen. Sir P.
Hermon, E.
Hervey, Lord A. H. C.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hill, A. S.
Hoare, P. M.
Hodgson, W. N.
Holford, R. S.
Holt, J. M.
Hood, Captain hon. A. W. A. N.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hornby, E. K.
Howes, E.
Hunt, rt. hon. G. W.
Hutton, J.
Ingram, H. F. M.
Jackson, R. W.
Jenkinson, Sir G. S.
Johnston, W.
Kavanagh, A. MacM.
Kekewich, S. T.
Keown, W.
Knight, F. W.
Knox, hon. Colonel S.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Laird, J.
Langton, W. H. P. G.
Laslett, W.
Lefroy, A.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lindsay, hon. Col. C.
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lowther, W.
Lowther, J.
Manners, rt. hon. Ld. J.
Manners, Lord G. J.
March, Earl of
Matthews, H.
Mellor, T. W.
Meyrick, T.
Milles, hon. G. W.
Mills, C. H.
Mitford, W. T.
Montagu, rt. hn. Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Moore, G. H.
Morgan, C. O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Morrison, W.
Mowbray, rt. hn. J. R.
Neville-Grenville, R.

Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
North, Colonel
Northcote, right hon. Sir S. H.
O'Neill, hon. E.
Paget, R. H.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Parker, Lieut.-Col. W.
Patten, rt. hon. Col. W.
Peek, H. W.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Percy, Earl
Phipps, C. P.
Powell, W.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Ridley, M. W.
Round, J.
Royston, Viscount
Russell, Sir W.
Salt, T.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Shaw, W.
Shirley, S. E.
Sidebottom, J.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, R.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, W. H.
Somerset, Colonel
Stanley, hon. F.
Stanley, Lord
Starkie, J. P. C.
Stopford, S. G.
Stronge, Sir J. M.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Talbot, hon. R. A. J.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Tipping, W.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Turner, C.
Turnor, E.
Vance, J.
Vandeleur, Colonel
Verner, E. W.
Verner, W.
Walpole, hon. F.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Waterhouse, S.
Welby, W. E.
Whalley, G. H.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Whitmore, H.
Williams, C. H.
Williams, F. M.
Wilmot, H.
Winn, R.
Wise, H. C.
Wright, Colonel
Wynn, Sir W. W.

TELLERS.
Noel, hon. G. J.
Dyke, W. H.

Mr. SYNAN *moved*, after the words "the support of reformatory and industrial schools for Ireland in aid of other grants," to insert the words "out of the rates."

Mr. WALPOLE said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government agreed to the insertion of these words?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he did. He understood the case to be this. Reformatory schools were supported, at present, partly out of Parliamentary grants and partly out of local rates; and he understood the object of his hon. Friend's Amendment to be that where any Parliamentary funds formed a part of the means by which the schools were supported, the surplus funds should not be applied in relief of the Parliamentary grant.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he would ask whether the public money was to go to the relief of the rates?

Mr. SYNAN said, the present law was this—there were in Ireland two species of grants for the support of industrial and reformatory schools; the one out of the public Exchequer, the other out of the rates. The surplus fund was a local Irish fund; and he moved that whatever should come out of this Irish fund should go in relief of Irish and not of Imperial taxation.

Sir JOHN ESMONDE made an appeal to his hon. Friend not to press his Amendment. They were all anxious that this question should be settled as soon as possible, and as the Amendment was opposed by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) and his Friends opposite, they ought not to trouble the House by dividing.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not insist on pressing his Amendment. His hon. Friend might be assured that he would not lose the opportunity of enforcing his views at a future time in this matter.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Subsequent Amendments read a second time; several *agreed to;* several *disagreed to;* and several amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause 23 (Redemption of annuities and life interests of ecclesiastical persons).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. SULLIVAN) said, he wished to recall the attention of the House to the explanation given on the preceding night by the First Minister of the Crown, with respect to this clause which was subsequently postponed. He would remind hon. Members that the right hon. Gentleman had, at the same time, proposed an addition, providing that "The Commissioners shall, at any time between the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, but not afterwards, if it appears to them as respects any diocese or united dioceses in Ireland, as the case may be, or as respects any Protestant Nonconforming body or communion, that not less than four-fifths of the whole number of ecclesiastical persons in such diocese or united dioceses, or of the whole number of the ministers of such body or communion, authorized to commute under this Act, have commuted or agreed to commute their life interests, the Commissioners shall thereupon pay, in addition to the monies otherwise payable by them, a sum equal to seven pounds in the hundred on the commutation money payable in respect of each life interest, such addition to be disposed of in the same manner as the commutation money in respect of which it is added." He moved that the clause, after line 38, be restored to its former shape, and that the House disagree with the Amendments made by the Lords.

DR. BALL said, he wished to guard against being supposed to approve the whole clause. He was, however, ready to admit that the addition was an improvement—inasmuch as it contained an alternative proposition with regard to the commutation of the annuities, so that a single annuitant, or an aggregate number of them, might commute their annuities. The clause, however, did not provide any margin whatever for the expense of the machinery required by the clause as it now stood. And, in his opinion, the number in a diocese who were required to agree to commutation—four-fifths—was rather large.

MR. GLADSTONE said, the words used in the addition now proposed had reference to the dioceses as they were formed under the Temporalities Act of 1835.

Amendments in Clause 23, the postponed Amendment, read a second time, amended, and *agreed to.*

On Motion, That a Committee be appointed to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed.

MR. DISRAELI: Before you put that question, Sir, I cannot refrain from expressing my deep regret that the Amendments made by the Lords in this important Bill have been repudiated by this House, under the advice of the right hon. Gentleman. When we calmly consider at the present juncture the nature of the Bill, its object, and the general character of its provisions, every candid and impartial mind must admit that the attention of the other House of Parliament was solicited to one of the greatest questions that probably could ever engage its attention, and under circumstances of trying difficulty. The principles upon which this Bill is founded had been submitted during the last Parliament, not in so complete a manner, but in a certain degree, to the consideration of the House of Lords, and they found no favour in that Assembly. Subsequently, there was an appeal to the country on the dissolution of Parliament, which, however, certainly did not take place upon that issue. ["Oh!"] Surely hon. Gentlemen do not for a moment mean to insist that if this policy had not been brought forward there would not have been a General Election. Why, Sir, a dissolution was inevitable owing to the passing of the Reform Bill. Do hon. Members mean to say that the late Parliament viewed the passing of the Reform Bill as a matter which did not compel a dissolution? The Gentleman who entertains that opinion must have very different opinions indeed from those which I have hitherto held of the working of the Constitution. He must be a Gentleman of very liberal opinions indeed. It is not accurate to say the appeal was made to the country in consequence of this subject being introduced by the right hon. Gentleman; but I am quite prepared to admit that the question was conveniently raised at a time when, from uncontrollable circumstances, the opinion of the country would be expressed upon it, and, in certain portions of the country, public opinion was expressed in a distinct manner. That expression of opinion was sufficiently general to justify the then Government in accepting it as the verdict of the country; and the right hon. Gentleman had, so far as we could conduce to his convenience, every accommodation for considering the details of his policy and introducing a measure embodying that policy to this House. That measure after what occurred here, to which I will not advert, was sent up to the House of Lords. Now, it is a matter of notoriety, not for a moment to be contested, that the opinion of the majority of the House of Lords was unfavourable to the Bill. Their Lordships prolonged their discussion of its principle and policy with power and spirit, and a variety of talent which completely satisfied the country, and maintained the reputation of a great Assembly. Almost all the eminent Members of that House spoke upon the principle of the measure, and Leaders of all sections of opinion—not merely confined to those who acted in concert with the late Government—had an opportunity of discussing it. It was a question of moment what course the Lords would take, because it was well known that the majority of their Lordships were opposed to the principle of the measure, and that if the ordinary course were adopted they would not have permitted the Bill to be read a second time. But I think, whatever difference of opinion there may be—and of course there is great difference of opinion—as to the wisdom of the course which the House of Lords took in reading this Bill a second time, all must agree that the course taken by the House of Lords was distinguished by its magnanimity. Men of transcendent ability and very great influence in the country, who were opposed to this Bill, voted and advised their Friends to vote for its second reading; because, after a frank exposition of their views on the Government policy, the points to which they particularly objected and the remedies and modes of relief by which they thought their objections might be obviated, they waived their opposition in deference to the representation of the Leader of the Government in the other House of Parliament, that the First Minister would be favourable to a generous and conciliatory consideration of all the Amendments that would be brought forward by those who disapproved the general principles of the Bill. On the other hand, it was, of course, understood that the Government could not pledge itself to acquiesce in any Amendment that might be proposed, but would promise only to consider it with a sincere desire to meet the views it expressed if possible. Well, Sir, the character of the Amendments that would be moved was made known to the Government before the vote of the House of Lords was taken upon the second reading, and the House of Lords passed, with few exceptions, all the Amendments brought forward by prominent Members of that House connected with different political parties; indeed, I can remember no Amendments, at the present moment, of any importance which were rejected. Some of those Amendments were even accepted by the Government without opposition, certainly without a division, and the Amendments in due time came down to this House. What has been the result? With some exceptions so trifling I cannot recall them, for they are merely clerical, the House of Commons under the advice of the right hon. Gentleman has repudiated all the Amendments of the House of Lords. Even so slight an Amendment as was made with regard to the unfortunate curates, that humble and injured class in Ireland, which commanded the sympathies of every hon. Gentleman opposite, and which I surely felt would be conceded by the Treasury Bench, was rejected by the imperious spirit which controls our fortunes; a division was demanded, even upon that issue, so painful to the feelings of many hon. Gentlemen opposite that, though they had supported the Government on every other issue, they left the House and would not divide. I want to know how the right hon. Gentleman can reconcile his treatment in the House of Commons of the Amendments of the Lords to this Bill with the representations which were made and the expectations which were held out in the other House of Parliament by his chief Colleague, the Leader of that House (Earl Granville). I deeply regret the course which has been taken here, for although I opposed upon principle the measure of the Ministry, and although I have not changed my mind in regard to the character of the Bill, I, at the same time, declare that I have sincerely worked with a wish to render it less noxious, and with a hope, if possible, of our passing a Bill this Session. But, instead of that, after the majority of the House of Lords made these sacrifices, and after they had agreed to the second reading of a Bill, the principle of which they disapproved, upon the representations made by the chief Colleague of the right hon. Gentleman, and after these Amendments were brought down for our consideration, what occurs? What occurs? Why, the right hon. Gentleman has counselled the House to refuse any approbation of any of these Amendments, and another Colleague of the Minister, the President of the Board of Trade, absolutely got up to-night and threatened the House with dissolution. ["No, no!"] — which was a most unconstitutional proceeding—as the penalty of these Amendments being adhered to. [*Murmurs.*] I am in the recollection of hon. Gentlemen who heard that threat, and the murmurs of those who were not present will not affect the truth of the allegation. I say that the words which were used were these—that if an adherence to these Amendments should cause the failure of the Bill it might lead to another appeal to the people. What was that, I say, but an intimation to the House of Commons that if those Amendments were not rejected we must be prepared to meet our constituents. ["No!"] Well, Sir, if such an event should occur, I, for one, shall meet my constituents without fear. And when I meet them I shall express my opinions of the policy of the Government, as I have expressed them here, with frankness. And nothing shall prevent me from expressing my deep regret at this moment that, after what has occurred with respect to this important measure in the House of Lords, the right hon. Gentleman should not have received the Amendments of that assembly, at least, in a spirit of wise conciliation.

Mr. GLADSTONE: If, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman should have occasion to meet his constituents, either in consequence of a dissolution or in consequence of any other minor circumstance —and probably the latter is more to be expected than the former—I hope the right hon. Gentleman, when he proceeds to make out his case and his title to their confidence, will first of all explain to them with what incomparable adroitness he yesterday escaped giving a vote upon the subject of concurrent endowment by first of all discovering that it was not involved in the Preamble, and that, therefore it was too soon, and then, when we came to that unhappy clause of Lord Stanhope's, by finding that we had already decided it by implication, and therefore it was too late. On the subject of dissolution the right hon. Gentleman says that he heard the menace of my right hon. Friend (the President of the Board of Trade), yet not a man in this House gave the slightest indication at the time of interpreting the words of my right hon. Friend as a menace. Every allusion to the possibility of a dissolution on the part of a Minister is not a menace. [*Murmurs.*] Well, then, I will try your rule by the words of the right hon. Gentleman himself. I ask any man who heard my right hon. Friend whether it was not perfectly plain that my right hon. Friend's allusion was in the nature of a general reference simply, and had no regard whatever to the likelihood or unlikelihood of a dissolution under present circumstances. But, Sir, the House has noticed the indignant manner in which was rebutted my plea that every allusion to a dissolution by a Minister was not a menace, and the Gentlemen on that side of the House indicated in the manner which they thought appropriate that, in their opinion, every such reference to a dissolution is a menace if made by a Minister. They, therefore, condemn my right hon. Friend and rebut my plea in his favour. Well, it so happens that the subject of dissolution has come in in another way, for the right hon. Gentleman has had occasion to discuss whether the dissolution of last year did or did not occur on the Irish Church question. Now, Sir, these are the words which were used by the right hon. Gentleman —and I commend them to the serious reflection of those hon. Gentlemen whose vocal organs were put into exercise just now, in order that they may reconcile them with the doctrine which they appear to hold. I shall likewise apply in another way what I am about to read. On the 4th of May, last year, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I told Her Majesty that, with her permission, under the circumstances with which, from my previous narrative, the House is perfectly acquainted, the advice which Her Majesty's Minis-

ters would, in the full spirit of the Constitution, offer to Her Majesty would be that Her Majesty should dissolve this Parliament."—[3 *Hansard*, cxci. 1705.]

I hope, therefore, it will be acknowledged that an allusion to a dissolution made by a Minister is not necessarily a menace. But, Sir, the question has been raised as to the point on which the opinion of the country was challenged, and the right hon. Gentleman has denied to-night that the dissolution took place upon the Irish Church question. He has denied it to-night, but what I maintain is that he asserted it last year. [Mr. DISRAELI: I said dissolution must have taken place.] But that was not all that the right hon. Gentleman said. Does he deny that in the hearing of this House he stated, last year, that Her Majesty's Ministers would advise Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament and to take the opinion of the country as to the conduct of Her Ministers and the question of the Irish Church? It is not, however, for so paltry a purpose as catching the right hon. Gentlemen in what, I have no doubt, was a slip of memory that I referred to the glaring and positive contradiction uttered by him to-night and the words which I have just read. The right hon. Gentleman has registered his protest against the conduct of this House with respect to the Irish Church Bill. Moreover, he complains of the pledges that have not, as he says, been kept, and of the disrespect with which, as he urges, the Amendments of the House of Lords have been received. The pledge given in "another place" on the part of the Government was this—that Amendments such as we could approve would be thankfully received; that Amendments, whether we could approve them or not, would at least be respectfully considered. I believe I am quoting, with pretty close accuracy, the very expressions that were used. Have we redeemed that pledge or have we not? The right hon. Gentleman says we have done nothing. I say that what we have done, what the Government has recommended, has made me feel that I was pressing for the patience and the indulgence of the majority of this House. Private endowments, forsooth! Private endowments, that were valued by the Opposition at £200,000 sixteen years hence, because that is the average duration of clerical life, have been commuted into a donation down of £500,000, and that in deference to the other House of Parliament. And that is doing nothing! And that is one of the violations of pledge with which the right hon. Gentleman charges us. Commutation! Have we done nothing there? We are not bound to commutation; the Irish clergy have no claim to commutation; they have their claim to their annuity. Could they have complained, if we had offered them in this Bill the market price of their annuities, had we offered them the same price, or a trifle above the same price, they could have got elsewhere? We compute their annuities, through the use of the public credit, at such a rate that they will obtain for them from the Government 15 per cent more than it would have been possible to obtain in the open market. But that is not all. Seeing what anxiety was entertained, and anxious ourselves to search out with minute fidelity the possibility of making concession after concession, when it could be done with faithful regard to the principle and basis of our Bill, we ourselves discovered on behalf of the clergy that which no hon. Gentleman opposite had discovered, that the life of the clergyman was better than the average life of the layman, and we therefore freely and fairly met the Amendment of the House of Lords — which I believe was a death sentence upon all commutation whatever —with the offer to add 7 per cent to the value of the commutation, which monies would come, I believe, to an amount little short, if at all short—supposing it to be acted on by the body—of £400,000. Then, says the right hon. Gentleman, there was a point with respect to the curates on which we divided, and it was so trifling that our own followers, ashamed, could not accompany us into the Lobby. Well, Sir, we have just divided with a majority of 72. [*A laugh*]. God forbid that I should interfere with the laughter of an hon. Member, but if that hon. Member, who is not always supposed to be one of the most moderate men in the world, will upon every occasion exhibit the moderation which induces him not only to be contented, but to exult when he finds himself in a minority of only 72, he has obtained possession of a rule for the guidance of his future political life from which he will derive some advantage. Although we have now been in the predicament of dividing with a majority of 72, we divided in Committee on this question of curates with a majority of 96; and yet the right hon. Gentleman says our friends were so ashamed, notwithstanding their zeal and faithfulness, that they could not follow us. That is an example of the accuracy, the precision, the care with which the right hon. Gentleman makes his charges in these great passages of public debate and history which are meant to be recorded, not for to-day only, but for future days and ages. The right hon. Gentleman says our concessions were so trifling that he cannot remember them. What did the Lords do with regard to the curates? We had already found ourselves, by the dictates of that liberal equity which the majority of the House on that occasion, I admit, pressed us to indulge, obliged to impose a burden upon the ecclesiastical fund of Ireland in respect to the curates; although they had no vested interests that could be treated in strictness as such, yet, acting largely on the declaration we had given, that cases of fair claim would be considered in an equitable and not in a technical spirit, acting—if I may presume to use the word, of which I confess I am almost afraid—generously, we had already laid upon the central fund in respect of the curates a burden of certainly not less than £300,000. To that the House of Lords added a further burden of between £500,000 and £600,000, and they desired of us, in regard to the whole curates' work done in Ireland, with an exception that was insignificant, that we should doubly compensate—pay twice over—fully compensate the curate, and then fully compensate the rector. I think we should not have taken a very extreme course if we had rejected that Amendment altogether; but anxious to come to the furthest point we could for the purpose of meeting the view of the House of Lords, and to stretch to the uttermost the definitions that could be applied to the equity of the case, we made a considerable concession, and I was obliged to state at the time that that would lay upon the central fund of the ecclesiastical property a further burden of between £100,000 and £200,000. These are the sort of concessions in regard to which the right hon. Gentleman says they are so trifling he cannot carry them in his memory. Sir, I hold, in the face of the House of Commons, that every pledge that was given to either branch of the Legislature has been redeemed in the letter and in the spirit, and if there has been a limit to concession, it has been a limit fixed for us by our pledges given before another tribunal? And what is that other tribunal? It is the tribunal of the nation. Sir, it is remarkable to observe how, in these times, there has arisen what perhaps with some may be a mere lip-service to the nation; with others—and with most, I have no doubt—it is a frank as it is also a pregnant profession. The proposition has been freely laid down that that hereditary branch of the Legislature, which is appointed for the discharge of most important and most valuable functions in the Constitution, would not act wisely, and would make an abusive employment of its power, were it to place itself in conflict with the will of the people. It is true that refined theories have been advanced to show that those who sit in that Chamber are in some sort the representatives of the people like ourselves—nay, more, that they are even more than ourselves the representatives of the people, and that, consequently, we are not entitled, even when we come fresh from our contact with the national mind, to plead that we know, or can report, or can assert anything respecting it with an authority that is entitled to credit in that other and more gorgeous Chamber. Well, Sir, far be it from me to assert for the Members of the House of Commons any authority except that which they derive from their mission. But what was their mission? I have shown, from the words of the right hon. Gentleman himself, that it was to try the conduct of the Ministers, which we had impugned in connection with the Irish Church, and to try the question of the Irish Church, that the late Government advised a dissolution. It is too late to deny that this was the turning point, the cardinal question of the last election. A judgment clearer and more decisive never was pronounced. It is not upon one question in a hundred, even of more important subjects of public policy, that the nation is called upon to pronounce, or has the opportunity of pronouncing any such clear and such authoritative verdict. When that verdict has been pronounced I deprecate and protest against all attempts to evade its force, such as those which are made when it is asserted that although much indeed was said about the Irish Church at the election, yet the appeal to the nation had no relation to it, and was not an appeal for the settlement of that question. Be it remembered that the pecuniary terms granted by the Bill, as it now stands, to the Irish Church, about to be disestablished, are terms more liberal than at any period of the discussion of last year any person would have ventured to propose. I know nothing in which those terms can be said to fall short, except the matter of the glebe houses, the charge upon which, I will venture to say, is not one whit greater, nay, it is less, than the concession we have made to-night with regard to the curates, and for making which we are told by the right hon. Gentleman that it is so trifling that he cannot carry it in his memory. I ventured to state, last year, that probably from three-fifths to two-thirds of the estimated value of the Irish Church property would go to the disestablished Church or to its members, and I now believe that, setting aside, as a distinct matter, the additional value we give to Irish Church property by treating it as a public fund, possibly even more than two-thirds of the value of the property is appropriated by the Bill either to the Church or its members—upon condition that the services of the Church are performed. As the right hon. Gentleman has made a protest, I must, finally, make a protest on our behalf. The hard words with which we have been pelted during the whole of this controversy are not, indeed, to be made grave subject of complaint. On all occasions much allowance ought to be made for them; and I fully admit that the greatest allowance ought to be made on an occasion like this, when we have been attacking the legal, constitutional, and proprietary foundation of an institution to which many Members are attached. Therefore, Sir, I am not complaining, though the noble Lord opposite (Lord John Manners) talks of plunder and pillage and such things, but with every respect and deference I venture to intrude this plea on our behalf—that we decline to admit we are the enemies of the Church. In my opinion, in my deep conviction, if mischief has been done to the vital spirit of the Church—nay, if mischief has been done to the cause of Establishment in these discussions, it has been done chiefly by those who have described to us, in language which I believe to be unfounded, and which all must admit to be exaggerated, the grievous and enervating effect which a state of Establishment has upon the faith, and zeal, and life of the members of a religious communion, so that when we point to this or that community—be it Roman Catholic, Protestant Episcopalian, Methodist, Independent, or Presbyterian—in this or in any other part of the world, we are always answered by some one stating that these were voluntary societies that had not been under the enfeebling and almost emasculating influence to which, as a religious body, we are told, this unhappy Church of Ireland has been subjected. A distinguished Prelate has even placed on record these few words. Speaking of a provision by the laity for spiritual ministration from their own resources, he said—before the day of dissolution had come, before this proposition had been made, that Irish lay Churchmen were less prepared for this, less informed of their duty, and less willing to do it than the laymen of any other Church or religious denomination in the world. Well, Sir, if matters have reached that pass, it may hereafter prove that we, after all, if it be our duty and our destiny to strip this Establishment of its trappings, are not the worst friends of its inner essence. As to the prophecies and the predictions of its incapacity to cope with the proud pretensions and proved organization of the Roman Church, I repel them with all my heart and soul, and if I could not repel them I would say to myself and others—"If such be the Church to which we belong, so destitute of inherent life and vigour, the sooner we quit it and seek refuge for heart and mind in some other communion possessed of a truer vitality, the better." Sir, I confess for my own part—I wish to state it without offence, and I do not in the least resent these demonstrations of incredulity which I see upon the countenances of some hon. Gentlemen—that I cannot help placing upon record my solemn protest against those disheartening and degrading predictions, together with the expression of my humble, yet not altogether other than confident expectation, that though I admit there will be a crisis to pass through, though I admit there will be difficulties to encounter, though I admit there will be efforts to be made and trials to be undergone, yet before many years have rolled over our heads the time may come when the members of the disestablished Church of Ireland may point to the day of the passing of this Act and declare that that day, and none other, was the day of their religious regeneration.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, I accept the appeal the right hon. Gentleman has made to posterity, and I venture also to submit that when the time shall come for posterity to decide upon the course of the right hon. Gentleman it will not accord to it the applause which it obtained at the last election. He has told us, with respect to the dissolution, that my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) held out threats to the House upon the question on which we voted last year. He has told us that my right hon. Friend said that Ireland was not the question that was submitted to the constituencies of the country. But what my right hon. Friend really said was that the dissolution was inevitable in consequence of the Reform Bill, but that the circumstances which accompanied the dissolution made the Irish Church the chief subject contested at the elections. ["Oh!"] That statement appears to be met with ridicule, but I venture to ask those hon. Gentlemen who sit below the Gangway opposite, and who have used their lungs with so much force during these discussions, not in articulate, but rather in inarticulate utterances, whether their liberality will go so far as to say that when the Reform Bill had passed they would have kept together the then existing Parliament? But I will go further, and, with respect to that which has been quoted by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, I will say that if the last Parliament had not permitted the Government to complete the work they had in hand, it would have been the duty of that Government to have dissolved it, and to have appealed to the unreformed constituencies, and they gave notice of that to the House. Therefore, so far from being a threat, it was within the exercise of the constitutional duty of a Minister. But I say that it is a totally different matter when, in a new Parliament, at a moment when grave questions are impending between the two Houses, one of Her Majesty's Ministers, sitting on the front Bench, holds out to the House as a means of keeping them together to coerce the Lords, what is in that case not the constitutional statement like that of my right hon. Friend, but a threat of what would happen if the House were not firm. ["No!"] Well, I have no doubt that some of those who are so extreme in their expressions of dissent will be able to explain what was the meaning of the expression about a dissolution. The right hon. Gentleman did unquestionably allude to a dissolution. What did he mean by it? It is either a promise or a threat—call it which you like—when the House is told that, under certain circumstances relating to a question immediately impending, this House may be sent about its business. That, however, is a very small part of the discussion. We have to ask ourselves whether on this question the House of Lords have been treated by this House in a manner worthy of a House which, in its constitutional position, whatever may be its powers under certain circumstances, is only a co-ordinate Assembly with the House of Lords. This House is, indeed, newly elected by the people, and I am not going to diminish at all the force and power and authority that belongs to it in consequence; but I must remind hon. Gentlemen that the question submitted to the people with respect to the Irish Church was submitted to them in principle and not in detail. It was submitted in the first place, as a question of disestablishment, and in the second, to a certain extent, as a question of disendowment. But I confidently appeal to hon. Gentlemen—not, indeed, as to the advocates of voluntaryism, but as to any who come short of that principle—whether they can point to any election address of any Member of the House, upon whatever side he sits, which went to the extent of so complete a disendowment as is actually effected by the Bill. I venture to say, with the greatest submission to hon. Members who express their dissent, that during the elections hon. Gentlemen were careful to limit what they said upon disendowment, though they were absolute upon disestablishment. ["No!"] Well, Sir, in that statement, I have, of course, excepted a certain class in this House—and I am bound to say, a very considerable class—the advocates of the voluntary system who were in favour of doing away not only with the Irish, but also the Scotch and English Establishments, and who tell us, as we heard to-night in solemn tones—that reminded me more of the pulpit than of Parliament—that in upholding endowment and establishment we are only doing mischief to the interests of our Church. Now, I cannot help turning aside for a moment here and observing that even that very sect with which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hadfield) is connected, was not ashamed to seek in a Court of Chancery to become possessed of Lady Hewlett's endowment; and the hon. Gentleman, if I am not misinformed, was not only an advocate, but was employed as the legal adviser for obtaining possession of those endowments. The hon. Gentleman told us to-night that endowments are an evil and an abomination; but nevertheless, in the case I have mentioned, the sect to which he belongs was very anxious to get hold of them. Nor have I ever discovered that the friends of the voluntary system had any objection to participate in the endowments to be found in our Universities—endowments given for religious purposes. The hon. Member says that they hate endowments, but it seems that when endowments are to be got without coming to their own pockets for them, they have no objection to profit by them. As the hon. Gentleman appealed to us in such moving language, as if we had some selfish aim in view, I will ask what interest have we who sit here in the question of endowments except as it affects the welfare of religion, of the Church, and, as I believe, still more nearly, of the State? Sir, if I thought that the duty of the State was to relieve itself from any embarrassment in connection with religion, I should be happy to see the Church removed from any connection with it. But I say that the benefit of a Church Establishment is not so much to the Church as to the State, and that it is in the interest of the State to have a connection with religion. I know we have been defeated on that point, and that, after the two decisions given by this House and by the House of Lords, I am precluded from re-arguing the question so far as the Irish Church is concerned. I deeply regret that decision, but I cannot in consequence change my opinions. I deeply deplore that the House of Lords took the step they did in sanctioning that principle upon the second reading; but I feel still more strongly that having conceded so much they are entitled to expect from this House more consideration for their Amendments than they have received, and I regret that in urging this matter forward upon the relentlessly logical principles of the right hon. Gentleman you have given no consideration to the feelings, the dignity, and the honour of an Assembly co-ordinate with our own. Sir, I have listened in vain for an expression from the other side of the House of a different character from that which I have spoken of. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, indeed, said he would treat them with respect, but how did he treat them with respect? He said—

> "We can hardly expect of the House of Lords that they should appreciate the humble considerations which govern the special relations between each Member of Parliament and the portion of the British people that he represents. From the great eminence upon which they sit they can no more discern the minute particulars of our transactions than a man in a balloon can see all that is passing on the earth below."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcvii. 1903.]

The right hon. Gentleman knows that people do not get into balloons by coming down from the skies; they ascend into balloons from the earth, and they know just as much of what is passing on the earth as we do; and the House of Lords may be as familiar with the details of the Bill as the right hon. Gentleman himself. If ever the time should come which we have heard threatened by those who are the advocates of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman, when coercion shall be offered of a different kind to the House of Lords, by the selection of a large number of æronauts to ascend into "another place," those whom the right hon. Gentleman selects may remember with what contempt he has spoken of them, and I think he will not find Gentlemen who are willing to submit themselves to the dishonour which he intends to inflict upon them. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that he has been very conciliatory, and has done much more than he promised to do at the elections. What did he promise? Promises at the elections, no details of any measure being before the electors, must necessarily have been in general, and, to a certain extent in vague language. But it is the impression conveyed to the electors that must be taken into account. And here I must observe that when the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade spoke last evening of sentiments to which he had given utterance in his letter of seventen years ago, he was misleading the House, because he has expressed the same opinions much more recently. [Mr. BRIGHT: I have said so.] Yes; but the right hon. Gentleman did not say so yesterday. This particular point is one upon which I personally agree with the right hon. Gentleman; but I agree with him that it is not a subject which can be presented to the people now, and I have said on more than one occasion in this House. With respect to the glebe houses—with respect to the land of the clergy, and their general treatment, the language of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, when he spoke of gracious and generous treatment, was calculated to lead the people to believe that you were not going to treat this question as one simply of logic, simply of mathematics, and to limit it by nice and strict rules, such as have been constantly pointed out on the opposite Benches. The country could have had no reason to suppose that the gracious and generous proceedings at the hustings were to become sweeping and severe upon that Bench. I say that the right hon. Gentlemen who sit upon that (the Treasury) Bench led their constituents and the country to believe that the clergy and laity of the Church of Ireland would be treated in a different manner from that in which they have been treated. This question, again, has been argued by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government as if it was a question not of taking away but of giving. You are taking away and you forget that those from whom you are taking away are men who have had the property they now possess for 300 years. You forget their associations and their interests, and you forget that they are men of hearts, and passions, and prejudices, and that these things will weigh with them more than the logic of the abstract principles you lay down. But you tell us you give them £500,000. Sir, I accept that sum, and if you will, I accept it as a boon, as far as it secures freedom from litigation; but, at the same time, when the right hon. Gentleman says that some on these Benches—my right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Dublin (Dr. Ball) — valued those private endowments at a smaller amount, let it be remembered that the right hon. Gentlemen himself, with his means of acquiring information on the subject, told us, on the 1st of March, that £500,000 was the value of the private endowments since 1660. It is therefore clear that in proposing £500,000 as a substitute to fixing a date, the right hon. Gentleman is only giving us what he himself laid down as the actual value. [Mr. GLADSTONE: After the life interests.] Be that so. But the Commissioners are spared all the expenses of the costly investigations that would have taken place; and therefore when we come to consider the whole question, I think I may say boldly, and with perfect truth and faithfulness, that this £500,000 represents no more than the endowments subsequent to 1660. That, therefore, is no new concession to the Lords; it is only in another form that which the right hon. Gentleman promised to the Commons. But, with respect to the commutation, the right hon. Gentleman tells us that he has been generous, because, having to provide for the life interests of the clergy, he has not been content to be regulated by the Government tables which settle the value of lives; but, knowing that the clerical life is, on an average, so much longer—7 per cent longer—than the general life, he has taken that fact into account. Well, Sir, he has simply given what the clerical life is worth, and nothing more; and he will not give that in every instance, but only when the concurrence of four-fifths of the number has been obtained. The right hon. Gentleman confers no boon on the Church Body, unless he gives them such a sum as will induce all the clergy to come within the commutation, and as will compensate the Church Body for providing the life premium, instead of the Government having to provide it. Again, the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the liberality of the Government towards the curates. But, yesterday, there was an Amendment of the Lords, providing that if a curate, a miserable curate, in that Church which was to be disestablished and disendowed, became ill or disabled from carrying on his duties, he should still receive his annuity; and that Amendment was one which the Government thought it worth their while to strike out. Why, Sir, suppose a curate were to be disabled now, he would, no doubt, for a time, leave his curacy; but he would have the opportunity of the same number of curacies as he had before when he was well again, and he would have the chance of preferment in the Church to an extent which would be greatly reduced after disestablishment. And yet the Government, having given that small boon of some compensation to the curates, think it worth their while, in dealing with a co-ordinate Assembly, to deprive them of the miserable comfort they were giving to those curates who might become ill or disabled. I have now gone through the concessions which the right hon. Gentleman has spoken of, and I ask this House—if they were merchants, if they were people dealing with their servants, and they were dissolving their establishments, whether they would deal in that way with those who had relied upon their fairness, upon their justice, upon their indulgence, and, I will say, upon their generosity? I confess, I was almost ashamed to hear to-night the speech of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. W. H. Gregory), who, because he has been thwarted in that which was known to be his opinion on the question of concurrent endowment, thought it not unbecoming of him to say that he trusted if ever this Bill came before the House again, they would sell every glebe in the country to the highest bidder. [*Cheers.*] Yes, I have no doubt the hon. Gentleman will meet with support, even in that. I have heard many—no, I will not say many, but some upon that side of the House, who seemed to be prepared even to take away the life interests of the clergy—["No, no!"]—Oh! no! The right hon. Gentleman says "No," but I have heard myself—unfortunately we have not been able to hear expressions, but I have heard sounds which would indicate—that even such a proposition would receive a certain amount of support. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman has told us that the House of Lords is not to put itself in conflict with the will of the people. When that will has been clearly and decisively expressed, I am not prepared to say that I do not concur in that proposition. I think that the House of Lords occupies a position independent, no doubt, of the constituencies; but not independent of the general feeling of the country. They occupy a position which makes them closely acquainted with the general feeling of the country—through the Press, if you like—or through their residence in the country, and their constant intercourse with the people of the country—which, I am happy to say, amongst Peers, is just as free, and just as unreserved, as the intercourse between Commoners and the commonalty of the country. They have the means of knowing what are the opinions of the country; and they have shown by the division to which they came on the second reading of this Bill, a decision which I am free to say I, from conscientious convictions could not have been a party to, that they are ready to accept the expressed will of the nation. They consented to the second reading of the Bill, and so far as the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church is concerned, I admit that the question in both Houses of Parliament has fallen to the ground. But I say that those noble Lords, in making the Amendments they did, had a right to say that they had not convinced themselves that the national will is against such Amendments as they have made. Indeed, I believe, that many Members on the Liberal side are beginning to feel strange misgivings of heart as to the votes they have given. They may treat this as a question not of mercy but of justice; but their feelings are in conflict with the abstract principles that may be deduced from the measure of the right hon. Gentleman. If this measure is to be a measure of conciliation, if it is to bring peace to Ireland, you must feel that you connot bring peace to Ireland by this measure unless you meet in some degree the will of the whole people of Ireland. That will has been expressed in hundreds of public meetings. I am not particular as to the numbers—I care not whether they have been attended by 200,000 or 300,000 persons; but these meetings have been attended by Protestants of all denominations who say they are not satisfied with the measure of the Government, and that those things which we have in vain asked you to concede might have brought a message of peace to men who will be hostile to the right hon. Gentleman and his party for many years to come. Do you suppose you could take away the glebes and the churches without causing something stronger than a protest? Do you think that when dealing with men of like passions with yourselves, if you were to act upon those logical principles which the hon. Member for Galway wishes to carry out, it would not cause some such a conflict as, I am sure, the hon. Gentleman himself does not wish, and which would effectually put an end to all those hopes of peace which some entertain from this measure? Sir, it was not my intention to have said a word upon this question, but the right hon. Gentleman in his speech assumed so much—he spoke so strongly as to what he expected to be the results of what he has done—that I have ventured to appeal to this House, I appeal to the existing generation of my countrymen, I appeal to those who are to live after us and who will judge of what we have done to-night, and I ask them whether in dealing with this complex question there has not been a want of that generosity which was promised by those who sit on the Treasury Bench. Further, I will say that, in my opinion, there is in it a want of that just and equitable treatment which the Church of Ireland was entitled to expect at their hands, and which might have gone far to reconcile her members to their policy.

MR. BRIGHT: It is not my intention to follow the right hon. Gentleman through various topics which he has dealt with in the long speech he has just addressed to the House. I rise only for the purpose of referring to one statement which has been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli), and supported by the right hon. Gentleman who has just concluded his speech. I have not the smallest objection in any debates in this House to any amount of solid or hard argument, nor, indeed, have I any very strong objection to the use of hard words in debate. Much must be allowed for disappointment, and much must be allowed for the strong feelings which are occasionally excited. But I have a very strong objection to a course of misrepresentation for which there is no foundation whatever, and to having an interpretation put upon my speech which, I am certain, the majority of those who heard it will believe to be altogether unjust. The right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire is very skilful in finding out points which the bulk of his Friends, until he speaks, have been unable to discover; and this is one he has found to-night, for I will venture to say not a single Member of the House—I must believe it from what took place during my speech—not a single Member of the House, besides the two right hon. Gentlemen who have spoken, felt that when I referred to what might happen as an expression of opinion by the constituencies if the question of concurrent endowment were referred to them, the reference was made by way of menace or threat of dissolution. I was arguing against retaining the surplus with a view to concurrent endowment, and on the ground that concurrent endowment had been repudiated altogether by both sides of the House. I said that if the policy of the House of Lords on this question were again submitted to the constituencies, although hon. Gentlemen opposite might be as numerous in a future Parliament as they were now, those who would be returned in favour of the policy of concurrent endowment would be able comfortably to sit in the portion of the House immediately opposite to me. And what says the right hon. Gentlemen who has just spoken, coming, as he did, to support the very desperate case of the right hon. Gentleman who sits near him? He says that he knows he could not appeal to the constituencies on the question of concurrent endowment. But that was all I said—only that I illustrated and elaborated it a little, and brought it home to the minds of hon. Members more satisfactorily by picturing the deplorable situation of the supporters of that policy if the question were to be referred to the constituencies. What, I would ask, could be more absurd, more childish, or more—what shall I say—contemptuous towards the intelligence of the House than to suppose that a Member of an Administration which is supported by a majority of 120 votes, elected only a few months back, should be so stupid as to say anything that could be described by any honest interpretation as a threat or menace of dissolution. I can make great allowance, as I said before, for hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. They have a very bad cause, and with a bad cause they have had very little success. They have fought hard for a larger portion of the ecclesiastical funds of Ireland to be reserved to their friends of the Irish Church. They profess to be more Protestant than we are, and some of them to be more religious. and they favour us with angry speeches at the success of our Bill. The future will tell the results of the measure, as it tells the results of all measures. I have seen the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire just as angry about many other great questions. I have seen him come down—as I might say, if I were not afraid of being thought classical, *crinibus disjectis*, with dishevelled hair, and tell us of the horrible condition to which agriculture would be reduced by Free Trade in corn. I have been here twenty-five years, and will venture to say in the face of the House that there is not a single prophecy of the right hon. Gentleman which has been fulfilled. I do not, I repeat, object to hard arguments or hard words, but I do not like misrepresentation, and I am, I believe, never tempted to deal in it myself, and I am always careful to avoid it. The question which we are discussing is a very great question. We are settling what I regard as a great political and historical transaction, and I am sorry that upon the last night of its discussion right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who ought to set a good example to the House and especially to their party, should have forgotten those honourable rules which ought to subsist between the Members of this Assembly in the endeavour to fix on me a charge which, whatever may be my failings, I certainly am not stupid enough to be guilty of, and which I undertake, without hesitation, to say the great majority of the House believes to be without foundation.

LORD JOHN MANNERS: Sir, I shall certainly not follow the right hon. Gentleman through his self-laudation, nor will I stop to criticize his eccentric Latin. But as the right hon. Gentleman has terminated his speech with language which we seldom hear—fortunately in this House—impugning the good faith and political honour of my right hon. Friends on a point on which, I am sure, no Gentleman in this House believes they have been guilty, I venture, as I attentively listened to every word of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, to give my version of the matter. The right hon. Gentleman tells us what it was he meant to say, but he has omitted a very important portion of what he did say. What he really said was this—if, owing to any disaster that might happen to this Bill, the question were referred back to the constituencies, then those Gentlemen who were in favour of concurrent endowment would be less in number than they are now. Such is the interpretation which I, as well as my two right hon. Friends near me, have put on his speech. The right hon. Gentleman does not accept that as a fair interpretation of what he intended to say; but I am astonished that, because, in the heat of argument he used an unfortunate phrase, he should comment, as he has done, on the course taken by my two right hon. Friends for having, in the discharge of their duty, felt it necessary to refer to his speech.

MR. CHARLEY said, he trusted that, in case of a dissolution, the country, and especially the dissenters, would remember that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade was the author of this concurrent endowment. It was not the statesmanlike scheme of Mr. Pitt, but the bastard scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. He (Mr. Charley) denied that the national will was in favour of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues; he maintained that the hon. Gentlemen, by whom he was surrounded, were as true representatives of the national will as hon. Gentlemen opposite. He regretted that the House of Lords should have violated their conscientious convictions by voting for the second reading of this Bill; but he hoped that they would now adhere to their Amendments, and if they did so, they would have the support of the Conservative democracy of the country. He confessed he had used some strong language in the course of the debates on the Irish Church question, and if he had offended any hon. Members, he offered them now his sincere apology.

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—MR. GLADSTONE, MR. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, Mr. Secretary BRUCE, Mr. Secretary CARDWELL, Mr. JOHN BRIGHT, Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, Mr. AYRTON, and The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL:—To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

Afterwards—

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE reported to the House the Reasons, as drawn up by the Committee nominated for that duty, for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendments to the Irish Church Bill.

[*Lords' Amendments.*

Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendments *reported*, and *agreed to*.

To be communicated to the Lords.

FORTIFICATIONS [PROVISION FOR EXPENSES.]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) *Resolved*, That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the Expenses of the Construction of Works for the Defences of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, a sum, not exceeding £1,510,000, be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom; and that the Commissioners of the Treasury be authorized to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years, charged upon and payable out of the said Consolidated Fund.

(2.) *Resolved*, That the said Commissioners of the Treasury be authorized to direct the payment to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £1,510, for the management of the Contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 19*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading* — University Tests (177), *negatived;* Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (180); Sunday and Ragged Schools* (188).

Select Committee—Bankruptcy (28), *nominated*.

Committee—Report—Greenwich Hospital* (165-202); Stipendiary Magistrates (Deputies)* (179); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act (1860) Amendment* (159); Court of Session Act (1868) Amendment* (164); Local Government Supplemental* (140).

Report — Municipal Franchise (187-200); Companies Clauses Act (1863) Amendment* (147); Poor Law Union Loans* (194); Bishops Resignation (193-201).

Third Reading—Pensions Commutation* (138); Judicial Statistics (Scotland)* (151), and *passed*.

THE PORTADOWN INQUEST.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Duke of MANCHESTER said, he had received a letter from the coroner, Mr. Magee, with reference to a Question he recently put as to the adjournment of the inquest on the man killed by the police in the riot in Portadown. Mr. Magee stated that Mr. Atkinson, not himself, was the coroner for the district of Lurgan, and that he conducted the inquiry in the absence and in behalf of that gentleman; that he conducted the inquiry over three days—the inquiry being rendered extremely protracted by the manner in which the attorneys on both sides conducted the case; that at the close of the third day, when the question of adjournment arose, various difficulties arose on the part of the jury, who severally raised objections to the various days named; and that he himself, coroner for Armagh and Sessional Crown Solicitor for the county of Down, was obliged to attend the Assizes at those places, where several of the jurors also had business to attend to; and that Mr. Rea, an attorney, who attended to represent the friends of the deceased, stated that the inquest should be adjourned until after the Belfast Assizes. Mr. Magee accordingly left the question of the adjournment entirely to the jury, who, after consulting among themselves, fixed Tuesday the 3rd of August next as the day on which the inquest should be resumed. He (the Duke of Manchester) did not think this letter afforded a satisfactory ground for so long an adjournment; and he regretted that the Government, not being able to oblige the coroner to resume the inquiry at an earlier period, had not taken some other means for the exculpation of their servant, the sub-inspector of constabulary. According to the general opinion of the district, he fired without any necessity, and the evidence hitherto produced tended to that conclusion. It would have been a great advantage, both to the officer and to the authorities, if the inquiry could have been concluded in a much shorter space of time; but, for his own part, he felt he had now performed his duty in the matter.

Lord DUFFERIN said, he could only repeat that the Government had no power to interfere with the coroner's discretion, however much they regretted the adjournment. He did not at present think it advisable, when the inquiry had been so unfortunately interrupted, to enter into the particulars of the case; but the Government would be able in due time to judge whether the police were justified or not in firing.

UNIVERSITY TESTS BILL.

(*The Earl Russell.*)

(NO. 177.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, which was introduced into the House of Commons by my learned Friend the Solicitor General, but which is not a Government measure. The principal object of the measure is to remove the impediments that now stand in the way of those who cannot sign the Thirty-nine Articles, and which prevent their receiving the full privileges of the Universities. It is founded on the principle that the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham are national institutions, and that the whole nation is entitled to share in their benefits. There are two inconveniences and anomalies involved in the restrictions which now exist. One is that persons who cannot conscientiously subscribe to every one of the Thirty-nine Articles or to the whole of the Liturgy of the Church of England, are debarred from taking part in the government or teaching of the Universities; and the other is that those institutions are deprived of the benefit of having the best instruction which they might impart—for it is evident that the persons who are the best fitted may be excluded from Professorships on account of the religious opinions they happen to entertain. A man, for instance, may be a very accomplished chymist, but not being able to subscribe to the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, he would be ineligible for a Professorship. Now, in the opinion of the majority of the House of Commons, this restriction should be removed, and the whole nation should be admitted to the benefits and emoluments of the Universities. It is because I concur in that view that I invite your Lordships to give this Bill a second reading. The measure may be divided into two parts—one relating to the Universities and the other to the Colleges. With regard to the Universities, it sweeps away all the restrictions of the Act of Uniformity, and enables any person, without making any profession of faith, or signing any formulary, to obtain lay degrees, and become a member of the Governing Body. With regard to Colleges, it leaves them to frame their own regulations. Now, as to the wills of the founders, it should be remembered that about twelve of the Colleges at Oxford were founded before the Reformation, and that the wills of the founders providing for the Roman Catholic character of those Colleges have been set aside. Fellowships both in those Colleges and in the Colleges founded after the Reformation are confined to members of the Church of England. Even if this Bill passed, it would be possible for the Colleges, either by their own existing statutes or by any new rules which they might make, to continue that restriction; for while with regard to the Universities the Bill is compulsory, with regard to the Colleges it is optional. I should not have thought it necessary to say more had not the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) given notice of his intention to move the Previous Question. I cannot help saying that that is a rather unusual course. It is true that when a Resolution is proposed which persons may regard as inconvenient or inopportune, they sometimes move the Previous Question; but in the case of the second reading of a Bill on a subject which has for many years been almost constantly under discussion it seems to me to be an unusual and extraordinary course. In the Middle Ages it was natural, perhaps, that the Roman Catholic Church should encroach on territory which did not properly belong to it; and at the Reformation it was not unnatural that those who succeeded to the power of that Church should in a similar way encroach on the rights of the civil power. Many years ago no person could be married in this country except in accordance with the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, and parents could not register the births of their children unless they had them baptized according to the forms of the Church. Those restrictions were usurpations upon the rights of the civil power, and as such they have been removed. Marriages can now be solemnized both in the places of worship of different denominations and by registrars, while registers of births are no longer confined to children who are taken to church to be baptized. Now, the present restrictions with regard to the Universities and Colleges appear to me to be likewise an interference with the civil rights of the nation, and that every subject of Her Majesty ought to have the right of the benefits of those institutions. That they were intended to be Church of England institutions cannot be maintained, for many of the Colleges were founded before the Reformation, and the rules which their founders laid down are totally inconsistent with those which are now observed; while the doctrines now taught are such as the founders would have entirely disapproved. Nor can it be maintained that those Colleges which were founded after the Reformation should be confined to the Church of England, for it is clear that they were intended for the benefit of the nation at large. My opinion with regard to this Bill, as with regard to many measures bearing upon religious freedom, that have been introduced into Parliament, since 1815, is, that it is a wise and statesmanlike course to adopt the forms of our ancient Constitution to the circumstances and requirements of the present day, and it is on that ground that I ask your Lordships to give your sanction to this Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl Russell*).

The Earl of CARNARVON: My Lords, the noble Earl seems to take some exception to the Notice I have placed on the Paper, that I should ask your Lordships to adopt the Previous Question. Now, I can assure him that in taking that course I intended no want of courtesy or conciliation—indeed, he must himself perceive that it is more courteous than if I had moved the rejection of the Bill—my only object is that further time may be given for the consideration of so important a subject. The noble Earl said—and I heard the statement with great pleasure—that this was not a Government measure; but the cheer which he drew forth from the Bench opposite indicated that it was not one displeasing to the Government. Now, I regret that the Bill should have been introduced at the present time. We have come nearly to the close of a Session which has been engrossed with a subject quite enough to occupy most men's minds—so nearly, indeed, to the close, that, as my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Derby) remarked, it has been found impossible to take the opinion of the University of Oxford on this Bill. Yet the noble Earl has selected this occasion for bringing before your Lordships this very grave question, which affects not only the Universities but the Colleges, the Church of England, and the whole system of religious education in this country. The Bill, as the noble Earl has stated, is divided into two parts—the one affecting the Universities, the other the Colleges. As regards the Universities the Bill is compulsory, while as regards the Colleges it is optional. It throws open degrees, with some few exceptions, to persons of all religious opinions, and gives them the right of admission to the Governing Body. Now, I have long thought that the simple admission of all persons to academical degrees is, comparatively speaking, free from objection; while, on the other hand, I have always felt that there are difficulties in removing the tests and subscriptions which limit admission to the Governing Body. I conceive that the system which is in force at Cambridge is a wise one and to be defended on reason and on sound principle. At the same time I admit that there has, of late years, been a growing feeling in favour of giving admission to the Governing Body to persons other than members of the Church of England. If, therefore, the Bill had stopped there I should have considered the question one fairly open to discussion, even at this late period of the Session. It goes, however, much further, for it deals, not merely with the Universities, but with the Colleges. Now, whatever discussion there has been in the House of Commons, I beg your Lordships to observe that the question of tests with regard to the Colleges comes before us for the first time. Is it fair, I ask, that so large a proposal should, for the first time, be submitted to your Lordships at this period of the Session, encumbered as we are with other important questions. The noble Earl (Earl Russell) dwelt upon the national character of the Universities, arguing that it was the right of every subject of Her Majesty to receive his education there, no matter what his religious opinions. Now, as a matter of fact, that is the case at the present moment. As far, at least, as Oxford is concerned, I am not aware that any person of any religion is excluded from receiving University instruction. The noble Earl also referred to those tests as illiberal restrictions on freedom of conscience. Now, it seems to me that there is a true liberality and also a spurious liberality. When Professors and Tutors are required to subscribe certain declarations, it must be remembered that they hold their offices not for their private benefit, but for the discharge of the duties attached to such offices. Just therefore as we have a right to insist that the clergy shall adhere to a certain standard, so in the case of those intrusted with the education of young men we have a right to exact pledges, and to insist on their adherence to a certain standard in the matter of education. Now, this Bill confuses the difference between the Universities and the Colleges. Its very title is misleading, for it is called "The University Tests Bill," whereas it touches the Colleges rather than the Universities, for its main point is the removal of all restrictions with regard to the former. A College has always been regarded more or less in the light of a family, and young men have been sent there not with a view to mere instruction, but with a view to moral discipline and the foundation of character; and we ought, as far as possible, to surround them with every safeguard. The Colleges, as your Lordships know, are governed by a certain number of gentlemen who are elected Fellows, and who may be of various opinions on almost every conceivable subject, but who have this one bond, that they all acknowledge a common religion. Now, if you relax this tie, one of two consequences must follow. Either you will have wrangling and dispute about every election of a Fellow, and every election will be impugned on the ground that it has been decided, not by the fitness or unfitness of the particular person, but by religious prejudice; or the Fellows will come to some sort of compromise by simply ignoring all religious teaching. Now, is the country prepared for either of these alternatives? We have had experience of the value of Parliamentary safeguards, and I remember that when the University Reform Act was passing through this House, assurances were given that nothing would interfere with the religious teaching of the Church of England in the Universities. I cannot forget the pledges which were given by the Prime Minister; yet, if I am not mistaken, he is a supporter of this Bill. Now, when on a question of this sort there are great differences of opinion; when, on the one hand, as far as Oxford is concerned, there is a majority of members of the University against the Bill; when, too, there is a very large party in the country opposed to it; yet when, on the other hand, there is a majority in the House of Commons in favour of it—your Lordships, I think, will feel that it would be for the interests of the country, and for the interest of the Universities—which really ought not to be so frequently dragged before Parliament as has been the fashion of late years—if some understanding could be arrived at, and some common basis of negotiations accepted. It was for this reason that I moved the Previous Question, desiring to indicate the groundwork on which negotiations might, I think, be fairly entered upon, and to secure time, if possible, for the consideration of the question by the Universities and by the country. I wish it, however, to be understood that I am in no way binding the Universities, but am speaking simply on my own responsibility, and that should the scheme I am about to indicate not be adopted, or should it be met in any other spirit than that in which it is offered, I should hold myself entirely free to reconsider my individual position as regards this or any other similar Bill another year. It seems to me it would be but reasonable to ascertain, in the first instance, the number of Fellowships which are necessary for the practical working of the Colleges, and my impression is that it would be about half the present number. I say that, because I believe that recent changes in the discipline and work of the Universities have lightened and facilitated, to a certain extent, the work of the Tutors and Fellows, and that the Colleges have been made far more general than they used to be. Now, in that case, I would suggest whether it might not be possible to retain one-half of the Fellowships in all the Colleges on their present footing, with the same tests as at present, and to give up the other half to the University, the latter being held without any tests, and being open to men of all religions and creeds. The property would—for the present at all events, though perhaps not ultimately—remain in the possession of the Colleges, but would be partly applied to the University Fellowships. Another point is to my mind of great importance. I do not see the justice or wisdom of the arrangement which now allows Fellows, drawing emoluments of the University, to reside at a great distance and take no part whatever in the duties or work of the University. It is most important that henceforth Fellowships should be held subject to residence. I do not wish to go into details, but simply to throw this proposal out for future consideration. It would be, in all respects, a true compromise, for each party would give up something, and each party would gain something. Those who are anxious for a change would gain the most; for whereas this Bill is permissive and might lead to no action on the part of the Colleges, the proposal I have shadowed out would in a short time open a fixed number of University Fellowships to persons of all opinions, so that members of the Church of England would sit side by side with Dissenters, and all dispute and controversy would be avoided. It would give full scope to learning, ability, and industry, which we are told are now excluded, for it would give them their due weight in the Governing Body; and it would strengthen the University, which, after recent changes, needs strengthening. Your Lordships will remember that a short time since Oxford of her own accord admitted undergraduates unattached to any College, and that no doubt has involved new duties and responsibilities; so that, as far as my proposal goes, it would have the effect of strengthening the hands of the University. Moreover, it would give facilities for the operation of that clause of the University Reform Act which has remained a dead letter, but which was intended to enable Roman Catholics and Dissenters to have private Halls, for henceforward there would be no difficulty in a Roman Catholic or Dissenter opening a private Hall. It would likewise save the Colleges from the embarrassment to which the Bill would subject them, and preserve the benefit of religious education — and it should be remembered that there has been no period in the history of either University—certainly not in that of Oxford—when the education was not distinctly coloured with religious teaching. The proposal is in the interest of Dissenters as well as of the Church of England, for are Dissenters really ready to enter into a compact with the Roman Catholics, as a noble Lord opposite told us they had done with respect to the Irish Church, with a view to sweep away the whole religious character of the Universities? Have they no misgivings of what the result would be if young men were exposed to the unscrupulous Rationalist on the one hand and the active Roman Catholic propagandist on the other? This is a Dissenters' as much as a Church of England question, and it is but fair to suppose that they will look at it calmly and dispassionately, since it involves all Christian education whatever. Are the Christian parents of this country prepared to set aside all religious teaching, and to deprive young men seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen years of age of all these safeguards which have hitherto surrounded them at a period of life equalled, as I think Dr. Arnold said, by none in importance? If young men with minds so impressionable are surrounded by an atmosphere of religious doubt and scepticism, the result of it will be apparent throughout their after life. I do not object to religious controversy as regards persons of mature age, who are capable of judging for themselves; but as regards young men I do say that they should be surrounded by religious influences. This Bill, I would, in the last place, point out, is wholly unnecessary; for if any class of persons really desire that their sons should be removed from the faintest suspicion of religious teaching they are able, at this moment, to secure that end by entering them as unattached students. They may, as undergraduates, live in lodgings and be free from all religious teaching. On the other hand, by my proposal, they would take their degree and receive whatever emoluments or honours the University can confer, including a seat in the Governing Body; while the Roman Catholic and the Dissenter might receive religious teaching in private Halls, and would be also eligible for University Fellowships and for a seat in the Governing Body. The teaching of the Church of England would, on the other hand, be retained—and I would remind noble Lords who speak of the Universities as national institutions that the Church of England, being the Established religion and the religion of the majority of the people of this country, has a claim to some position in Colleges, whose system of religious teaching is so wide that the High Churchman and the Low Churchman can equally enjoy it. Dissenters, either as Professors or as the holders of University Fellowships, would be separated by no invidious line of demarcation from their Church of England colleagues, but would exercise the same rights and powers. It is in order to gain time for the consideration of this proposal by the Universities and by the country, as the groundwork for a fair, reasonable, and equitable compromise, and as not only a fair but a final settlement of the question, that I now move the Previous Question.

The Earl of MORLEY said, that with all deference to the noble Earl, he thought his speech had been one of the most inconsistent the House had ever heard. The noble Earl had found fault with the introduction of the Bill on two grounds. The first was that the House was so engrossed by the Irish Church Bill that it was incapable of entertaining anything else—an objection on which he would only remark that legislation would progress but slowly if only one measure could be passed in a year, particularly when a question had been discussed in both Houses for years. The second was that constant interference with the affairs of the Universities was seriously injurious to their interests. Now, he quite agreed with him in this; but the course pursued by the noble Earl was surely anything but likely to lessen that amount of interference; for if their Lordships rejected this measure now, they might depend upon it it would be very speedily returned to them in the same shape. The noble Earl had himself proposed a scheme which would interfere more with the polity and constitutional arrangements of the Universities and Colleges than the plan now under their Lordships' consideration. Fault had been found by the noble Earl with the title of the Bill because, as he remarked, there was no sufficient distinction drawn between the treatment of the Universities and the treatment of the Colleges. He (the Earl of Morley) would venture, however, to express his opinion that nothing could be more clear than the treatment proposed by the Bill to be dealt out to each. The provisions which affected the Universities were totally different from those which dealt with the Colleges—one part of the measure being compulsory, while the other was entirely optional. The Universities and Colleges were treated on totally different principles. He would, in the first place, say a few words respecting the effect the Bill would have on the constitution of the Universities. On this subject a great deal of very strong language had been used, which was somewhat exaggerated and disproportioned to the substance of the Bill itself. Without going at length into the question as to whether the Universities were national institutions or not, he would call attention to the fact that both recent legislation and the manner in which the subject had been dealt with by the Universities themselves tended to show that the Universities belonged to the whole nation, and not to any particular branch of it. The recommendations of the Commissioners, which had been carried into effect, the establishment of middle-class examinations, and the system of having non-collegiate undergraduates, indicated that every subject of Her Majesty was entitled to the advantages of a University education. How, then, did Nonconformists stand with regard to the Universities? They could take the degrees of B.A. and B.C.L., and hold the office of College Lecturer, and he believed that of Examiner in the schools. They could also become private Tutors—and any noble Lord who had been at either of the Universities must well know what an important influence, especially over students who were reading for honours, a private Tutor possessed. The Bill merely proposed to allow Dissenters to take the degree of M.A. at Oxford without subscribing to any religious tests, and to enjoy all the privileges of that degree. It further provided that at Cambridge, where they could already graduate M.A., Nonconformists might act as members of the Governing Body. Now, on the principle which he held to be the true one, that the Universities were national institutions, Nonconformists surely ought to be qualified to sit in the Convocation or the Senate. For his own part, he did not believe that the measure would produce any great effect at present. If, on the one hand, there were so many Dissenters at the Universities that they could exercise great influence over the government of the Universities, we could not in fairness and equity refuse them that position; whereas if, on the other hand, they were not sufficiently numerous to exercise much influence, there was no ground for the great alarm entertained by some noble Lords opposite. With regard to the Colleges, he was of opinion that the noble Earl had been a little hard upon the Bill. Its provisions were purely optional as far as the Colleges were concerned; and it should be remembered that all the existing Fellows had taken the tests to which the noble Earl attributed so great a value, and that it would be impossible for them to alter their statutes without the sanction of the Visitor, who was almost invariably an ecclesiastic. The noble Earl had remarked that Nonconformists might have, at the present time, all the advantages of a University education. This was, no doubt, quite true, but the noble Earl forgot to state from the prizes of that education they were altogether excluded. Of course the intentions of founders ought to be respected as far as possible; but he contended that when the condition of things had become so altered as they were at present from what it was when the foundations were made, Parliament was entitled to alter the application according to circumstances. This had been already done as regards scholarships restricted to particular localities or families, and he could not see, therefore, why their Lordships should refuse to pass this measure. It was said that the Bill would destroy the distinctive religious teaching at Oxford. In what, however, did that religious teaching consist? He had been at Oxford much more recently than many of their Lordships, and he believed that what he was about to state was correct. In the first place, Nonconformists were exempted from attendance at the College chapels. Then there were College lectures on the New Testament, which lasted two, or at the outside three terms during the residence of three years; and as a rule Nonconformists did not object to attend them. Besides these, there were divinity lectures, which Nonconforming students were not obliged to attend. At the University sermons, preached once a week, the attendance, he feared, was not very large. He could not see, therefore, how this Bill could alter the distinctive religious teaching at Oxford. The whole system of tests was out of harmony with the current of modern legislation. Public offices had been thrown open to all persons without distinction of creed, and he saw no reason why Dissenters should be debarred from obtaining the prizes of University education. Tests were not only useless, but a real evil. They had utterly failed in preventing those who subscribed them from afterwards changing their opinions. Was it not a notorious fact that in many common rooms at Oxford there were Fellows whose opinions differ widely from those they entertained at the time they graduated? Books had been written and things said which showed that these tests were, as a safeguard, perfectly useless. At Cambridge, he might mention, there had been during the last few years three Senior Wranglers who were Nonconformists, and who, in consequence, were unable to obtain a share in the emoluments of the University. In conclusion, he appealed to their Lordships to pass a measure which he felt assured would be for the interest of the Church as well as of Dissenters, and which would place the Universities in the position in which they ought to stand with regard to the nation at large.

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL said, that as a former member of the Governing Body at Cambridge, he wished to say a few words on this subject. He readily acknowledged the ability and good taste of the speech which had just been addressed to their Lordships, and he should endeavour to follow the noble Earl's example by discussing this somewhat difficult subject in a frank, conciliatory spirit. He must first say that he did not think that the noble Earl who moved the Previous Question was amenable to the charge of inconsistency which had been brought against him. The noble Earl had not moved the rejection of the Bill, but the Previous Question, and most rightly and consistently—his object being to afford their Lordships further time for the consideration of this important subject, and to enable them, if possible, to come to some understanding, whereby at some future time the great points at issue might be finally determined in a spirit of conciliation on the one hand, and with a due regard to the important interests on the other. He must next make a few comments on the circumstances under which the Bill appeared before them. The Bill had been introduced into the other House by an hon. and learned Gentleman, who stood in close relation to Her Majesty's Government, and yet they were told that that was not a Government measure. This fact put some of their Lordships in a position of some difficulty, and for this reason, that the purposes for which the Bill was avowedly introduced two years ago were somewhat startling, and such as the present Government must be supposed, by their relation to the proposer, to approve, and yet that this could not be fairly assumed in argument as certain and definite. He must refer to those purposes. He was, indeed, always most unwilling to enter into the opinions of any man, or even his professed purposes; he at all times preferred to consider the proposal that at the time might be before them, and not the presumed motives or views of him who brought it forward; yet it was impossible wholly to forget the speech with which the hon. and learned Gentleman, about two years ago, introduced that measure in "another place." The hon. and learned Gentleman pointed out that its design was to liberalize the Church of England and establish a nationality in the University as over against that of the Church. The University, it was said, was to guard and regulate the lamp of religious liberty; and we old-fashioned people were to be gradually illumined—like Melrose Abbey by the light from Michael Scott's opened tomb (as we were poetically told)—by the glow of this new-found light. Such statements rather startled sober people, and will linger in memory. He now mentioned these things to excuse himself, if in any respect he should seem to depart from strict impartiality in considering this measure, and should unconsciously show any bias when he desired to be perfectly fair. He now turned to the measure. This measure placed before them three very important subjects. The first was the removal of restriction in regard to degrees in both Universities. The Bill conceded a degree without tests, and also, if he understood rightly its words, a vote in the Senate at Cambridge and in the Convocation at Oxford. At present, in the University of Cambridge the degree of Master of Arts could be obtained without any signature or any test. They knew that at Oxford only the Bachelor of Arts degree could be so obtained. It would be his desire that both Universities should be put in the same position, and he should be extremely glad if the degree of Master of Arts were conceded by Oxford on the same terms as he thought it was rightly conceded by his own University. So far, then, he should go with the measure. Nay, more, to speak frankly, he did not know that he should feel any difficulty in conceding a vote in Convocation and in the Senate. He thought that arrangements that stopped short of enfranchisement, all other things being conceded, were ever unsatisfactory; and he did not believe that any very great harm would come to his mother University or to Oxford if the vote were conceded with the degree. But the Bill went further, and proceeded to enact that certain very important University offices which might be held by laymen—namely, the Professorships (except those of Divinity), on the one hand, and a position in the Governing Body of the University on the other—might be held without any religious tests having been imposed on the holders of the offices. There his difficulty began. In regard to the Professoriate, they might consider not only what was probable under a certain line of legislation, but also what was possible. For let them put the case conversely. Their Lordships had read a second time and passed through Committee a measure in which there was a sort of counter arrangement to this. In the Endowed Schools' Bill they had been so very tender in their regard to the consciences of others that they had provided not only a Conscience Clause, but a farther arrangement, by which any teacher, even in a secular lesson, might be prevented from inculcating any religious teaching that might be disapproved by any of those who might attend the teaching. Why had that been done? They had judged it to be so necessary to protect the rights of conscience that they had precluded a man's teaching what many of them held to be truth in any of the secular lessons, lest he should hurt the consciences of those whom he taught. Well, was it utterly unreasonable to suppose it possible that there might be such a thing, now or hereafter, as some candidate for a place in the Professoriate, either at Oxford or Cambridge, who might conscientiously entertain opinions which many of them might think very far removed from the truth? Were they to take no precaution in such a contingency? Was it so unreasonable for them to wish to protect the minds of young men from what they conscientiously believed to be error? Were they to prevent a schoolmaster, by a Conscience Clause, from teaching the truth to boys, and not only leave a Professor perfectly free to teach error to young men, but even remove any obstacle that might at present prevent him doing so? All this, it might be said, was very old-fashioned; that there neither was nor could be any real danger with a conscientious teacher, whatever might be his creed. He hoped there would be no danger; but when there was such a tender susceptibility in regard to the Conscience Clause, let it not be thought that all the argument was on one side, and that nothing could be fairly and reasonably urged in behalf of the retention of religious tests in the case of Lecturers and Professors. It had been proposed that there should be a new form of tests. That he did not consider desirable. If the subject were properly considered, some arrangement might be made without imposing a new test. Some provision might be made by which anyone so deviating from his bounden duty as to teach, in a secular lecture, that which was plainly opposed to the religious sentiments of the pupils should in some degree be brought to account. Then, with respect to the Governing Body of the University, by a paper that had been put in his hand he saw that the Oxford Council elected to the Grenfield Theological Lectureship. But the case was stronger in the University of Cambridge, for there the Council actually elected to the Regius Professorship of Divinity; so that they might really have a body of men at the Council Board who might never have taken any religious test whatever, and who might even be of different forms of belief, suddenly called upon to undertake the grave responsibility of electing the Regius Professor of Divinity. The third point to which he wished to advert had reference to the Colleges. He shared the opinion which probably a great part of their Lordships held, that the last clause in the Bill, which permissively allowed the Colleges to arrange for the removal of tests, was a clause entirely to be deprecated. And yet, even here, he did not wish to seem wholly opposed and obstructive. Even that matter, difficult as it confessedly was, might, perhaps, in some degree be adjusted, but certainly not in the way that was now before them. Say what they pleased, there were essential differences between the Colleges and the University, and they must recognize them. They might legislate in some degree permissively, and might give facilities to Colleges in some degree to provide for distinguished young men, being Nonconformists, who had been educated in their walls, but to introduce at the will of a bare majority all the confusion that would arise from the Fellows of the College—the members of the Governing Body of the College—being, perhaps, of different creeds; nay, from the Master of the College being, perhaps, of a different creed from the majority of the young men under his charge—such a proposal as that was completely unreasonable. It might be said, that this would be for the College to settle for itself; that the contemplated legislation was only permissive. But even that statement did not take in all the difficulties of the case. There were some Colleges in his own University which, he believed, by their statutes, imposed no religious restrictions in regard to masterships and tutorships, because they relied upon the Act of Uniformity. It was proposed by this Bill to remove that security. Thus, then, it might happen that a College which had not protected itself by private legislation might see this important change brought about by the vote of a simple majority. If this Bill were to pass, fundamental alterations, which by the Act that regulated the Universities could only have been introduced when the new statutes were framed by a majority of two-thirds of the Governing Body, could now be sub-introduced, after the statutes had been framed and all things settled, by a mere majority. With regard to the suggestions of the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), he was of opinion that it was well worth consideration whether there might not be permissive legislation, by means of which a restricted number of Fellowships might not be passed over by the Colleges to the University, and regarded as University

Fellowships. Colleges might be invited to consider this. He admitted that it was a very great hardship that a young man should come to the University, take the highest distinctions, and then have to go away without any of its emoluments. Not that he valued those emoluments so very highly; he was not taking a mere loaves and fishes view of the matter. Emoluments were higher than that; they were in some sort a substantial proof of what a young man had been able to do for himself; they would not only help him onward in life, but would often prove abiding encouragements. He would not, however, go by any means so far as the noble Earl. Half the Fellowships of a College would be far too many. What the proportion might be would be very easily ascertained by Her Majesty's Government conferring with the authorities of both Universities. He could answer for his own University, which had never been behindhand or illiberal, that the question would be discussed fairly. Again, he would be very glad to see any measures adopted which would further the establishment of Colleges and Halls for those of a different denomination from the Church of England. Let them, if they would, give every reasonable facility for the establishment of denominational Colleges. Let them also provide permissively that a certain number of Fellowships should be placed at the disposal of the Universities, and be regarded as University Fellowships, and that for them no tests should be required. Having done that, they would have done all that could be fairly required. That, he ventured to think, would be fair and reasonable legislation. He would not say that the Bill before the House was unfair, but he certainly did hold that it was unreasonable.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, that his objections to the course taken by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), and supported by the right rev. Prelate, were two; in the first place, to move the Previous Question was, in another form, to move the rejection of the Bill, and to defer legislation for a year; and, in the second place, the proposals which the noble Earl had made, were not before the House. The compromise which the noble Earl had suggested was that they should throw open one-half of the College Fellowships for University competition — and he thought the Dissenters would be content with that. But it was not the number that they insisted upon, but the principle. As a member of a University himself, he protested against being supposed so far inferior to a Dissenter that the latter should be admitted to compete with him for half only of the Fellowships of the Colleges of the University to which he belonged. He did not think that the Church of England was in such a low state that it had need of such restraints for its protection. He would call their Lordships' attention to the fact that this Bill appeared before the House in a very different form and spirit from what any similar measure had done before. In the elections which had been held last year, this question was brought before many constituencies, and in several rural places, in which one would not have imagined that the people had ever considered such matters as University education, the candidates were subjected to a searching test, and asked what their course would be in the event of such a measure as the present being submitted to Parliament? Many of the Members who had been returned to the House of Commons had taken up this question in a very different manner from what might have been expected. It was no light matter, when they saw one of the Members of the University of Cambridge say that, so far as opening the M. A. degree, with all the privileges thereafter arising, he thought it was a proposition which might be assented to; and the other Member, his Colleague, took the same view; while one of the Members for the University of Oxford said that this whole question was worth consideration. Now, when this question was submitted to Parliament, two years ago, it was treated by the other side in a very different spirit. This Bill was to be regarded as a compromise. It was compulsory, so far as the Universities were concerned, but gave the Colleges power to act as they thought fit; it only said to the Colleges—"The nation will not interfere to prevent those who are deserving from obtaining Fellowships. We leave it to you, the Colleges, to say what rules you will make in this matter." This was a compromise; and, if rejected, the time might come when, as in the case of other compromises which their Lordships had an opportunity of accepting, but had rejected, they would find themselves in the bitter position of having to consent to something much more sweeping. He thought the principle embodied in this Bill the very least they could ask the Dissenters to accept, and he would give his vote most cordially for the second reading.

Lord LYTTELTON said, that having voted formerly against a similar measure, he felt bound to admit that he had changed his views, and would now vote for the second reading of this Bill. He would say little of the Universities as distinguished from the Colleges. He had been long in favour of opening the Universities as far as this Bill proposed to do—not, indeed, on the ground of right, but of high expediency. He could not admit the ground of right. But the Colleges stood on entirely different ground from the Universities, and he was bound to say that he should see with much regret the adoption of the principle of this measure by any large number of those Colleges. He held that the Colleges were similar in principle to boarding schools, and he desired to see them maintain a distinct religious tone as places of education, and also of social intercourse; but he could not bring himself to the opinion that it was for the State to force that character upon the Colleges. It was for the Colleges themselves to regulate a delicate and difficult matter of that kind; nor was it certain that in every case that the Acts of Parliament it was proposed to repeal were the best means of insuring the religious character of those bodies. It was rather probable, as had been suggested, that, if the Colleges were left to act for themselves, many of them would maintain their specific religious character with more clearness than was done under the present system, while others might adopt a different course. At all events he believed it was right to allow the Colleges to determine the question for themselves in their own way.

Then a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put?—Their Lordships *divided:* — Contents 54; Not-Contents 91: Majority 37.

The Earl of Camperdown

CONTENTS.

Hatherley, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Normanby, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Camperdown, E. [*Teller.*]
Clarendon,
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
De La Warr, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E. [*Teller.*]

Eversley, V.
Halifax, V.
Sydney, V.

Abercromby, L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clermont, L.
Congleton, L.
Foley, L.
Hatherton, L.
Lawrence, L.
Lurgan, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Methuen, L.
Monck, L. (*V. Monck.*)
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Vernon, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Beaufort, D.
Northumberland, D.
Rutland, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ailsa, M.
Bath, M. [*Teller.*]
Bristol, M.
Salisbury, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Annesley, E.
Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Carnarvon, E. [*Teller.*]
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Kellie, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.

De Vesci, V.
Doneraile, V.
Gough, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Bangor, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Lichfield, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Aveland, L.
Braybrooke, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Cairns, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Colchester, L.

Colville of Culross, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Egerton, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Forester, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Kilmaine, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lytton, L.
O'Neill, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Ross, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sinclair, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Templemore, L.
Tredegar, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE BILL—(No. 187.)

(*The Earl of Lichfield.*)

REPORT OF AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

LORD REDESDALE objected to the Bill, on the ground that it imposed obligations on women which could not but be objectionable. It was said that women had been appointed overseers, and that if they were qualified to act as overseers they were qualified to vote. No doubt, in some cases, women had been chosen to fill that office—no doubt the case in small places in default of any more eligible person, and there was also no doubt the duties had been properly discharged in such cases; but it was one thing to appoint a woman under exceptional circumstances and another to make an objectionable rule.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY thought it desirable the House should understand precisely what his noble Friend objected to. This was not a proposition giving to women the municipal franchise for the first time. Previous to the passing of the Municipal Act, in 1835, women did vote at municipal elections, but that Act took away their right to do so. Subsequent Local Government Acts gave them the franchise in the places in which those Acts were in force; and hence arose the anomaly that, whilst they could vote in the numerous towns in which the Local Government Acts were in operation, when a town obtained a charter of incorporation they were excluded. Therefore, this Bill merely restored to women a franchise which they formerly enjoyed, and their Lordships were not discussing the wider and more doubtful question of extending to women the right to vote at Parliamentary elections.

LORD CAIRNS said, that as an unmarried women could dispose of her property, and deal with it in any way in which she thought proper, he did not know why she should not have a voice in saying how it should be lighted and watched, and generally in controlling the municipal expenditure to which that property contributed.

Further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3^{a} on *Thursday* next; and to be *printed* as amended. (No 200.)

BISHOPS' RESIGNATION BILL—(No. 171.)

(*The Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

REPORT OF AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

LORD REDESDALE suggested that it would be better to confine the operation of the Bill to that part of it which related to the voluntary resignation of Bishops.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK said, that one of the provisions of the Bill was that the coadjutor Bishop was to perform all the spiritual duties of the diocese at a remuneration of £2,000 a year. Now, if the work could be done for that sum, those who were agitating for an increase of the Episcopate would say that that increase could be easily effected by a redistribution of Episcopal revenues. Another objection he had to the Bill was that the coadjutor of either Archbishop, although the junior Bishop, would be placed at once above all the other Bishops of the province.

LORD LYTTELTON hoped that, whatever was done, it would not be supposed that this Bill in any way touched the larger question of an increase of the Episcopate, the necessity for which, he trusted, would still be borne in mind.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET was understood to comment on those provisions of the Bill which relate to the payment to be made to a Bishop totally incapacitated for duty.

LORD REDESDALE thought that on a matter of such importance they might give farther consideration to the subject, and bring in a Bill free from the objections attending the present one.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that every difficulty connected with so complicated a subject as this had been well weighed in the framing of this measure, which had been drawn by a skilful draftsman. It certainly was desirable that there should be the power of appointing an assistant or successor in the case of a Bishop who was incapacitated from performing his duties, instead of the existing arrangement being continued. He did not believe that the arrangement respecting the emoluments provided by the Bill was open to the objection urged against it by the noble Earl. The emoluments were as nearly as possible divided between the outgoing and incoming Bishop; and though it was true in the case of a coadjutor being appointed the retiring Bishop received the larger share, yet it must be remembered that the maintenance of the episcopal residence devolved upon the retiring Bishop — who would also, no doubt, take considerable interest in the charities of the diocese. There were one or two further Amendments which he desired to see introduced. One of them, which was overlooked on the previous evening, was in the case of an Archbishop, whose strictly archiepiscopal duties ought not to devolve upon the coadjutor, but upon the Bishop senior in rank in the province—upon the Bishop of London in the case of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and upon the Bishop of Durham in the case of the Archbishopric of York. With the Amendments that he proposed he believed that the Bill would work well, and no one could deny that a strong necessity existed for some such measure.

Further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow;* and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 201.)

PARLIAMENT—ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

OBSERVATIONS.

Lord CAMPBELL, in rising to call attention to that part of the Report from the Select Committee on the Construction of the House, in which it was recommended that larger powers of interference should be given to the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees for the maintenance of Order; and to move a Standing Order that, when two or more Peers rise to address the House at the same time the Chairman of Committees, subject to the decision of the House, should call on one of them to do so—said, that he found that he was precluded from proposing the last portion of his Notice that evening by the Standing Orders, and he would, therefore, confine himself to calling attention to the subject. The Select Committee to which he referred in his Notice recommended the House to take into consideration the policy of dividing the functions of the noble Lord on the Woolsack. It was only necessary to allude to the recent debates upon the Irish Church Bill to show that a power of deciding between the claims of noble Lords competing for a hearing ought to be lodged somewhere. This absence of necessary authority gave rise to tumult and disorder, by which the dignity of the House was lowered in its own eyes and in the eyes of the public while many noble Lords were prevented from taking a part in the discussions because they were unwilling to depend for a hearing upon the clamour of their friends or the forbearance of their opponents. This state of things, too, imposed a most invidious power upon the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. He did not desire to utter a single word against the wisdom of their Standing Orders, as they were framed by their predecessors; but the state of things at the time of the framing of those Standing Orders was very different from what it was at present. A noble Friend of his assured him the other day that in the time of Henry VII. the number of the Members of their Lordships' House did not exceed fifty. It was evident, therefore, that rules framed at that time were not adequate to their present requirements. The Select Committee recommended the division of the functions of the noble Lord to whom the Great Seal was entrusted, or that his powers should be so increased that he might be enabled to perform those duties so ably exercised by the Speaker of the House of Commons. But these recommendations he would pass by, as involving too great and too sweeping changes. It remained only, therefore, to consider how far it was possible to invest the Chairman of Committees with this duty. The Chairman of Committees was a creation of the House, and was not exposed to any suspicion of partiality that would not be equally applicable to the case of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The noble Lord who at present presided over the debates in Committee (Lord Redesdale) was, he knew, adverse to this proposal; but, however amiable that objection might be on his part, it would not, he felt convinced, be permitted to influence the conclusion at which their Lordships would arrive. He trusted that his Motion would elicit the opinion of their Lordships, and, according to the opinion and the judgment of the House, he should be determined either to take no further steps in the matter, or to fix a day when, according to the Standing Orders, it would be competent for him to propose the Motion of which he had given notice.

EARL GRANVILLE said, there were some points on which he could not agree with his noble Friend who had just addressed the House. He did not think that in the debates on the Irish Church Bill the House had lost much of its dignity, either in its own eyes or in the consideration of the public, from the circumstance that on one or two occasions two noble Lords rose to speak at the same time. He believed his noble Friend over-rated the power of the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition. They had absolutely no power in respect of the speeches which were to be delivered; but when there was a long debate, an arrangement was sometimes come to as regarded the time at which Peers whom their Lordships were anxious to hear should deliver their speeches. He did not think he need discuss the proposition to give the Lord Chancellor more power after the remonstrances which they heard from his noble and learned Friend, and the objections which other Peers had made to it, when this subject was brought under the notice of their Lordships a few nights ago. With regard to the suggestion that the Chairman of Committees should fulfil the functions of Speaker he (Earl Granville) was himself somewhat blameable for having led the noble Lord (Lord Campbell) to allude to him. He (Earl Granville) had spoken of him more on account of his personal qualities than from his official position. They all knew the despotism, mild, yet firm, displayed by his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees against which new Members like the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) were, at first, rather inclined to rebel; though they soon learned to submit themselves to his rule. No one was better qualified to exercise the duties of Speaker than his noble Friend; but he thought they would do well to rely upon the good sense of the House, and the authority of other noble Lords who had studied the rules and orders of the House, to preserve the due order of their debates. On the whole, he thought their debates were carried on in a manner convenient to themselves and not discreditable to the reputation of their Lordships' House. As a rule, the Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the House were allowed to conclude a debate; but there were one or two noble Lords who refused to be bound by that understanding. It was true that in the late debates there were Peers who would have wished to speak; but their not having got an opportunity of doing so was to be attributed to the fact that the House was of opinion the subject had been sufficiently debated. He was afraid he might be considered rather Conservative in his views on the matter; but he must confess that he could not concur with his noble Friend that there were such deficiencies in their present system as he seemed to suppose.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he did not agree with his noble Friend (Earl Granville) that a remedy was not required, and he (Lord Lyttelton) hoped that the matter would not be lost sight of. He had been a Member of that House for a great number of years, and he was fully satisfied that the state of things now, as regarded the order of their debates, was very much worse than it was some years ago. It seemed to him that the spectacle of two noble Lords standing up and insisting on speaking, without any authority to decide which of them was to proceed, tended to make the House very ridiculous in the eyes of the world, whilst it discouraged many young Members addressing the House.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter before
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 19*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES]—Select Committee—On Telegraph [197], *nominated.*

Supply — *considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates, Class IV.

Public Bills—*Resolutions* [July 16] *reported*—*Ordered*—*First Reading*—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [223]; Basses Lights (Ceylon)* [224].

First Reading—Militia Pay.

Second Reading—Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* [201]; Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) [216].

Report of Select Committee—Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment [No. 334]; Seeds Adulteration [No. 335].

Committee—Inclosure of Lands* [31]—R.P.

Committee — *Report* — Dublin Freemen Commission [189]; Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks* [199].

Report — Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* [77-221]; Suburban Commons* [174]; Seeds Adulteration* [49-222]; Poor Law (Scotland) Act (1845) Amendment* [80].

Third Reading—Jamaica Loans* [200]; Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* [173], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Dublin Freemen Disfranchisement* [168]; County Administration* [119]; Mines Regulation* [84].

THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL.

QUESTION.

Mr. STAPLETON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government are cognizant of any negotiation between the Bavarian Government and the Austrian Government, or between either of those Governments and any of the German Governments, with respect to the course to be pursued by them in regard to the Œcumenical Council; and whether he can inform the House on the subject by Papers or otherwise?

Mr. OTWAY said, in reply, that the Government were informed that there had been a negotiation between the Bavarian and the Austrian Governments on the subject of the proposed Œcumenical Council at Rome; but that information did not come before Her Majesty's Government in any official form. In fact, they knew it only because it had been published in all the German newspapers. He was therefore unable to say that he should be able to lay any information on the subject before the House.

PRIMARY EDUCATION.—QUESTION.

Viscount SANDON said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, What progress has been made in the inquiry into the educational condition of Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester; what are the instructions to the Commissioners conducting it; and how soon the House will be informed of the result: and, whether, considering the statements published by some competent authorities as to the educational condition of the Metropolis, the positive denial of their accuracy by others, and the absence of authentic information on the subject, Her Majesty's Government will extend the inquiry to the Metropolis, in order to guide Parliament in the consideration of the measures affecting Primary Education announced by the Government for next Session?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, in reply, that he could not give the noble Lord the instructions to the Commissioners—in fact, he did not think it was at all usual for a Department, when engaged in preparing a Return, to give the instructions as to the mode in which that Return was to be obtained. The Department would be glad to have the assistance of the noble Lord, on account of the general interest he took in education, if he would give them any hints or suggestions as to the best mode of making the Return. The Department would make use of the office of Registrar General in obtaining the statistics, which he trusted would be ready some time in September or October. They would send down two of their Inspectors—Mr. Fearon and Mr. Fitch—to obtain information with regard to the schools in November and December, and the two gentlemen selected for that purpose were well known as able Inspectors, and for the skill with which they had conducted many inquiries. It was hoped that the information would be ready for Parliament soon after the opening of next Session. As to the other Question, about extending the inquiry to London, his noble Friend (Earl De Grey and Ripon) felt that he could not so extend it. The inquiry was specially ordered by the House for the three towns, not with the idea that the information was absolutely necessary for legislation, but because it was thought advisable to check the information they had already obtained. Some progress had been made with the matter; but it was almost impossible to get such a Return for London by the next Session of Parliament. If they were to attempt to get such a Return, in all probability legislation on education would be delayed, and besides, the Return would involve an amount of expense which the results would hardly justify.

CHINA—HONG KONG—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—QUESTION.

MR. BOWRING said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Colonial Office addressed a Circular Despatch in the course of last year to the Governors of the various Colonies defining, the duties and responsibilities of *ex-officio* Members of Legislative Councils; and, if so, whether the Colonial Office have yet received any notification from the Governor of Hong Kong of his having communicated the contents of this Despatch to the *ex-officio* Members of the Legislative Council of that island for their information and guidance?

MR. MONSELL said, in reply, that a circular despatch, such as the hon. Member described, had been addressed to the Governors of different colonies; but no information had been received from the Governor of Hong Kong, stating that he or anybody else had communicated the contents of that despatch to the *ex-officio* Members of the Legislative Council of that colony.

IRELAND — STATE AID TO IRISH NONCONFORMISTS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL STUART KNOX said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, When he will fulfil the promise given on his behalf by the Prime Minister on the 7th of May, to bring in a Bill this Session to lighten very greatly the burden on the nonconforming congregations for debts contracted by them in the erection of churches and meeting-houses?

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE, in reply, said, this Question referred to one point only, which would naturally interest the hon. and gallant Gentleman, in the proposed measure for loans to be made to religious bodies in Ireland for the purpose of providing their ministers, upon easy terms, with places of residence. The opinion of the Government on that subject was in no way changed; but in the present state of Public Business it was quite in vain, and was unreasonable, to call upon Parliament to consider that subject during the remainder of the present Session.

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CABLES. QUESTION.

MR. STACPOOLE said, he wished to ask the Postmaster General, Whether any Contract or Agreement has been entered into with any Manufacturing Company or Private Establishments by which it is provided that such Company or Establishment should be exclusively employed when it became necessary to repair or to relay the Submarine Telegraph Cables about to be purchased by the Government; and, if any such Contract or Agreement has been made, whether he will place a Copy of it upon the Table of the House?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, in reply, that no such contract or agreement had been entered into by the Post Office, and none such would be entered into by that Department without full notice to all parties who might be disposed to tender.

ARMY—CAVALRY REGIMENTS FOR INDIA.—QUESTION.

MR. STACPOOLE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in filling the augmentations of the Cavalry Regiments next proceeding to India, regard will be had to the claims of a Major who was compulsorily placed on half-pay, and is not yet restored to a position equal to that from which, without having committed any offence, he was displaced five years since?

MR. CARDWELL replied that he was not able to answer the Question in the interest of any particular officer; but when the augmentations of the regiments proceeding to India were made, he trusted that all just claims would be found to have been fairly considered.

PACKET SERVICE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND FRANCE.—QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM GALLWEY said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether any steps have been taken to bring under the notice of the French Government the great inconvenience and delay to which passengers proceeding through Boulogne and France are unnecessarily exposed; if he is aware that the boat from Dover to Calais did not, on the morning of Thursday 1st July, leave Dover for Calais until eleven o'clock a.m., one hour forty-five minutes after its appointed time, and then crossed the channel at half speed, occupying in its passage two hours and twenty minutes; that no fixed service can take place from Dover to Calais in strong easterly winds; and that the English packets from Dover and Folkestone to France are insufficiently provided with boats, and that in case of a collision at sea, the loss of life must be enormous; and to ask him if he would not consider that a Select Committee or an International Commission would prove of the greatest service to the International communication between the two countries of England and France?

Mr. BRIGHT: Sir, I shall not pretend to give an answer to all the particular Questions of the hon. Baronet. I can only say that I agree with him as to the very unsatisfactory state of the arrangements of the passage from England to France. The Board of Trade have had an inquiry into the subject, and a very interesting and able Report has been presented to the Department. That Report has already been laid upon the table of the House, and it will, I suppose, almost immediately be in the hands of Members. I may state further that it is intended to send a copy of that Report—I am not quite sure that it has already been forwarded—to Paris, in order that it may be laid before the French Government, in the hope that the question, some time before long, may be considered with a view to an improvement in the means of transit between England and France. That is all I can say at present with regard to the Question of the hon. Baronet.

SURPLUS OF THE IRISH CHURCH FUNDS.—QUESTION.

Sir FREDERICK W. HEYGATE said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in considering the application of the surplus funds hereafter to accrue from the Irish Church, regard will be had to the locality from which such surplus is derived?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am afraid, Sir, the Question of the hon. Baronet is somewhat premature; I do not mean in his assuming that the Irish Church Bill will pass, but I mean it is premature because the hon. Baronet must be aware that the financial operations under the Bill are of a very complex character, and that it will be very difficult indeed to say how far any particular portion of the surplus will bear a local character. The object of the Government, in all that they have said and done, has been to insure the general distribution of this surplus all over Ireland; but I think I may say that where it does bear a very distinctly local character, it will be desirable that that should, in some degree, be recognized. Upon the whole, however, I think my answer must be that an equable distribution over Ireland will be the best mode of applying the surplus.

ARMY—DRILLING AT ALDERSHOT. QUESTION.

Mr. O'REILLY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it would not be desirable that, in the present hot weather, the drills at Aldershot, especially the Brigade and Divisional field days, should be carried on in the early morning and not in the heat of the day?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that the arrangements for the drills at Aldershot were at present in the hands of a most distinguished and experienced officer, and he had heard no complaints that they were not carried out with a due regard to the health and comfort of the troops.

VAGRANCY.—QUESTION.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he wished to ask the President of the Poor Law Board, Whether the Returns show an increase of Vagrancy in the Country during the past six months; and whether, if such increase continues, he will undertake to attempt legislation on the subject next Session: and, whether, in undertaking such legislation, he will consider the proposal to transfer the care of Vagrants from the Poor Law Authorities to the Police, and the cost of their maintenance to the County or Borough Rate?

MR. GOSCHEN said, in reply, that the Returns of Vagrancy made to the Poor Law Board were half-yearly Returns, made up to the 1st of January and the 1st of July. The Return for July in the present year had not yet been received. It appeared, by the Return of the 1st of January, 1868, the number of vagrants relieved was 6,129; by the Return of the 1st of July, 7,946; and by the Return of the 1st of January, 1869, 7,020. These Returns showed a great increase in the number of vagrants relieved in the summer of last year, as compared with those applying for relief in January of the same year. On the other hand, the Return for last January showed a decrease of 926, as compared with the preceding July. With regard to legislation, he could state that that subject would be considered irrespective of the question whether or not there had been any increase in vagrancy; and the subject of the transfer of the care of vagrants from the Poor Law authorities to the police was under the consideration of the Home Secretary and himself.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—QUESTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury; What Class of Estimates would next be considered? The House was last engaged upon Class II., and the next in order was Class III., upon which he (Mr. Newdegate) had given a very important Notice with reference to the interruption of the freedom of discussion. He found by the Orders that Class III. had been passed over, and that they were not to proceed with the remainder of Class II. He wished to know when it was intended to take Class III.?

MR. GLADSTONE said, in reply, that the practice now pursued with respect to the Estimates was conformable with the ordinary rule, which was to appoint a special period for the Education Vote, which usually led to an extended expression of opinion. The remaining Votes in Class II., and the Votes in Class III. would be resumed in their regular order after the Education Vote.

COLONEL FRENCH said, he would beg to ask the Prime Minister, When it will be convenient for him to state to the House the measures that the Government do not mean to persevere with; in other words, when the "slaughter of the innocents" is likely to take place?

MR. GLADSTONE: Directly we know the course to be taken by Parliament with respect to the Irish Church Bill—which must be now considered quite a proximate event—the Government will announce the course they mean to take with regard to all other Bills of importance.

DUBLIN FREEMEN DISFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

In reply to Mr. J. LOWTHER,

SIR GEORGE GREY stated that as the House had sanctioned, by a large majority, the second reading of the Dublin Freemen Commission Bill, he did not desire to proceed with the Dublin Freemen Disfranchisement Bill.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

SCHOOLS OF SCIENCE.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. SAMUELSON said, he rose to call attention to the higher Government Schools of Science in the Metropolis in connection with the Science and Art Department. He considered that a growing interest and importance attached to this subject. From the manner in which the Estimates were prepared, it was difficult to ascertain what amount was given to Science and what to Art. The sum allocated to education in Art had produced the most excellent results. That which had been devoted to the Department of Science had scarcely received proper consideration from the House. It was most desirable that attention should be called to this subject. The Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster) would probably himself confess that he had not given to that Department the amount of attention which it deserved. Its administration had, he believed, been almost wholly left to the Secretary of the Science and Art Department, aided in respect to science by an officer of Engineers, who could—though a man of considerable scientific attainments — not efficiently direct education in science so far as the Government were concerned. The amount of the Vote which was to be taken that evening was somewhat over £230,000, but that by no means covered the whole annual expenditure for Science and Art. Besides this, there were the sums for buildings—for the University of London, and for the Scotch Universities. He was not going to criticize the Votes in detail in all its ramifications; it would be admitted, he thought, they were all in the right direction. It might, however, be doubted whether more consideration should not be extended to the provinces. The Science and Art Department had made grants to elementary science schools and the grant to teachers, about £25,000, was increasing, he was glad to find, year by year. The elementary science schools, intended for the industrial classes, were doing an excellent work, only retarded by two causes, which it would take some time to remove. The first of these was the want of adequate preparation in the pupils, for almost all the examiners complained of the want of elementary knowledge on the part of those who came up for examination, some of them being scarcely able to spell correctly. The other was, that the instruction given was too much of the nature of "cram." This arose partly from the incomplete character of the education of some of the teachers themselves, and partly from the insufficient means at their disposal for imparting sound knowledge. The want of teachers had been felt and acknowledged, and to meet that want he was sorry to say the qualification of the teachers had been reduced. What, in his opinion, was required, was the institution of a normal school for science teachers, similar to that already in existence for Art teachers. There were nominally two, but really three superior schools of science existing in London. There was the Mining School in Jermyn Street, which comprehended the College of Chemistry, and the School of Naval Architecture at South Kensington. What was called the Mining School was, in reality, something very much beyond that. It included classes in natural history, in mechanical drawing, and other subjects, and was what he might denominate an imperfect Polytechnic School. It was to be regretted that it included no department of mathematical instruction. The discoveries made at the Chemical School far more than repaid any cost involved in its maintenance, whilst the School of Naval Architecture at South Kensington rendered services to naval architecture, not only in England but throughout the world. These three schools had all received considerable sums of money from the Estimates; but they were all in some points defective. The School of Chemistry in Oxford Street was altogether too small; its laboratory was about the size of an ordinary London drawing-room. He had compared the School of Chemistry at Oxford Street with the College of Chemistry at Berlin, and he found that the space available for laboratories at Oxford Street was 1,000 square-feet, or about one-fortieth of the area available for similar purposes at the German Schools—about the size of the coal cellar of the laboratory at Berlin. At present there were about forty pupils receiving instruction there, and from fifteen to twenty pupils had been refused admission in the course of the present year for want of room. With respect to the school in Jermyn Street, it had greatly encouraged a taste for scientific study among the working classes. Lectures to working men were given there from time to time, about 600 tickets being issued, and the theatre on these occasions was always filled. But anything like consecutive or detailed instruction could not be obtained at these lectures. The laboratory of Dr. Percy, who was one of the greatest metallurgists of the age, and whose work on metals had been translated into every foreign language, was in the small back yard of a tailor's shop, while Professor Goodeve, the lecturer on mechanics, was obliged to keep his models on a range of shelves from which they could not be removed without the greatest risk. The anatomical preparations of Professor Huxley were made in a dark closet about eight feet square, and so low that a man can scarcely stand upright in it. That was the state of the School in Jermyn Street. But while this was going on he found that a very noble building was rising up in South Kensington, of which the House and the country knew very little. It was referred to in the Treasury Minute of December 5, 1865, signed by the present Secretary of State for the Home

Department, and he understood it would cost £190,000, of which £25,000 had been spent. But from that time to the present very little had been heard of it. The accommodation for students would be about 34,500 feet, or thirty-four-and-a-half times that at the disposal of the College of Chemistry. What he wished to ask his right hon. Friend now was to state to the House what was their present intention with regard to the application of that building. It was clear that the schools in Jermyn Street and in Oxford Street could not remain in their present condition. The building in Jermyn Street, which was occupied by the School of Mines, was partly devoted to the Geological Survey, but the officials engaged upon it had not there sufficient space for the duty assigned to them. If ever the School of Mines were removed from Jermyn Street, the building would not be too large for the Geological Survey. If he might be allowed to make a suggestion it would be this, that an amalgamation of the different schools should take place. He would not remove the lectures to working men from Jermyn Street. It was of great importance that these lectures should be given in the most central part of the town, and besides, there was a theatre in Jermyn Street which was exceedingly well adapted for the purpose of these lectures, and which he would be sorry to leave unused. It was also necessary that certain lectures should be illustrated by the admirable geological collection in the Museum at Jermyn Street, and these he would propose to continue at that institution. But with these exceptions, he would recommend that the whole of the Government science schools should be concentrated at South Kensington. The result would be a great economy both in time and teaching power. This was the case in foreign countries; and it was the more necessary, because at present the School of Mines—which was also a department of engineering—had no means of teaching mathematics, which the school for Naval Engineering and Architecture was ready to supply, and the want of which was greatly felt. The question was whether, if this amalgamation were effected, any additional expense in buildings must be incurred in order to accommodate these three schools. He was inclined to think that, with a proper economy of space, the buildings, now in course of erection at South Kensington, would afford all the accommodation that would be required for some time to come for a Polytechnic School. He believed this institution might also be made to supply a want that was much felt as to the deficiency of scientific training on the part of the teachers in our elementary science schools. South Kensington might be employed, not only for the instruction of the general public, but also for training science teachers. He had thought it right to call attention to this matter, not because he doubted the zeal and ability of his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. E. Forster), but because he thought the House ought to take a deeper interest than they did in scientific education. Whatever had been done hitherto had been done by the Government itself; but public opinion was now sufficiently alive to the importance of scientific education, and it was the duty of the House to support the Government in the matter.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the hon. Gentleman had made a speech full of valuable suggestions, but it was difficult for him to reply to them, as they referred to a Vote which followed the one he was about to move on Elementary Education. He must either therefore discuss this question twice over—both now and when it came in its regular course, which he thought was very unreasonable—or he must postpone it till they arrived at the Vote, and he hoped his hon. Friend would agree to that being done.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £560,711, to complete the sum for Public Education (Great Britain).

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he was sorry to have to ask the attention of the Committee for some time to a statement of dry details; but he would endeavour to strike the balance between two feelings—the desire to have full information, and the feeling that we have arrived at a period of the Session when long speeches ought to be avoided. He was about to ask the Committee for a large sum of money. The whole amount of the Education Vote for this year was £840,711, which was an increase of £60,657 beyond that of last year. The Committee would expect him to explain these items, and the reasons for this increase. It was an increase almost entirely for England and Wales, and mainly arose from annual grants for the day and evening schools. There had been a slight decrease of £852 in the charge for the London office, there having been a saving in the employment of copying clerks. There had been an increase, under the head of inspection, of £1,692, two additional inspectors having been required in consequence of the increase in the number of schools and scholars. The item for the normal schools and training colleges was the same as last year—namely, £73,000. The building grants for Great Britain showed an increase of £8,000, being this year £38,000. The annual grants in aid of schools showed an increase in Scotland of £1,200. In England and Wales the increase was large—£49,367. With respect to the building grants for Great Britain, the Committee would see that the actual expenditure for last year was £33,655, as against £29,975 in the previous year of 1868, being an increase last year in these grants of £3,680. He might, therefore, be asked why he now took a Vote for an increase of £8,000. The reason was that the information received by the Department showed—he was glad to say—that there was a greater feeling in the country in favour of education. The demand for education had increased of late, and the increase was mainly for the last half-year. That left £49,367 increase in annual grants, or, in round numbers, £50,000, of which about £44,000 was due to day schools, and a little over £5,000 to night schools. These sums he had analyzed in order to ascertain the cause of this increase, and he found that of the £44,000 increase for day schools, £36,000 was due to the increase in the number of scholars, and £8,000 was due to an increase in the amount of the Capitation Grant. The increase in the number of scholars in assisted schools in the year ending the 31st of August, 1868, was 7½ per cent, and a proportionate increase had been estimated for the present financial year, involving an increased expenditure under this head of £36,000. The increase in the amount of the Capitation Grant from 9*s.* 9¼*d.* for last year to 9*s.* 11*d.* for the present year—an increase which must be regarded with satisfaction, inasmuch as it was an evidence that the children had learnt more—was mainly owing to the Minute of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone (Mr. Corry) having now come into more full operation. The principle of that Minute was that besides the Capitation Grant for reading, writing, and arithmetic a further sum should be given for higher education. The proportionate increase in the number of the children taught in evening schools was 20½ per cent. The next point upon which the Committee would naturally require information was what kind of education had been secured for the children by means of this expenditure. For the sake of convenience he should exclude the figures relating to Scotland, remarking, however, that the average attendance of scholars in that country was much larger proportionately than that in this country—one-third of the number of scholars in English schools having to be deducted for non-attendance, from the total number on the books, whereas only one-sixth have to be deducted for that reason from the number on the books in Scotch schools. Notwithstanding this comparison to the advantage of Scotland, he must, however, state that the present system in force in Scotland, in his opinion, was not calculated to meet the requirements of the increased population of that country. Seeing that a special Bill had been introduced with the view of dealing with education in Scotland, he would say no more upon that subject. Now, with respect to England and Wales, up to the year ending August 31, 1868, the number of separate schools assisted by Government grants, which had been inspected, was 7,406. In these institutions there were often separate departments, in which the head masters were independent of each other. The total number of day departments inspected, therefore, was 10,857, and of evening schools, 1,941. These schools provided an aggregate accommodation for 1,663,043 scholars, there being actually on the registers 1,453,761; while the average attendance was 978,521 in day schools, and 55,154 in evening schools. The number of certificated teachers engaged in these schools was 11,102, assisted by 10,677 pupil teachers, and 1,253 assistant teachers. The cost of the schools was provided for as follows:—By Government grants, £414,926; by school fees, £420,742; and by endowments and subscriptions, £472,738. Thus, in a population of 21,649,377, we were getting taught in Government schools at a direct cost of, in round numbers, £415,000—at an expense to the parents of £420,000, aided by subscriptions past and present amounting to £470,000, to some extent, about 1,450,000, and substantially rather more than 1,000,000 children in 10,800 day schools and 2,000 evening schools, by rather more than 11,000 head teachers, assisted by 1,250 assistant teachers and 10,500 pupil teachers. So much for the numbers, and now for the results. Out of the total number of children on the registers about 400,000 were under six years of age. He considered good infant schools a good preparation for after education; but it could not be regarded in the light of substantial education. A great deal of delusion had resulted from the comparison made with regard to Prussia on that point, for infant schools were not there regarded as educational establishments. Deducting the number of infants from the roll, there were 1,060,000 on the books of the schools. But of that number there were presented for examination only 640,000 in the day schools and 53,000 in the night schools. The number of children in the day schools who had passed without failure in reading, writing, and arithmetic was 428,850, and 35,572 in the night schools. The percentage, therefore, of the scholars who had passed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, was 67 per cent, and the percentage in the day and night schools was almost exactly the same. In estimating the relative progress that had been made, the increase in the population must be taken into account. Now, the increase in the population of England and Wales, in the course of last year, was about 1 per cent. Bearing this fact in mind we should find a much greater progress in education, and in almost every respect a greater proportionate progress than last year. Thus in the number of children on the registers, the improvement was 7 per cent, as against 5¼ per cent last year. The attendance this year showed a similar percentage of improvement—7⅓, against 5½. Of those who presented themselves for examination, the proportion also was increased by 8, against 4½ per cent. Better still, the proportion of those who had passed without failure showed an improved percentage of 10⅓ per cent, against 6⅔ in the previous year. The improved attendance at the evening schools was still more encouraging—20⅓ per cent, as against 14 per cent; and in building schools there had been, as he stated, greatly increased activity, 41 more having been built in 1868 than in 1867, although in that year, as compared with 1866, there had been a slight falling off. Then, again, there had been a considerable increase in the number of pupil teachers. With all the advantages of the Revised Code, it was no doubt productive, at the time, of considerable discouragement to pupil teachers; but the current appeared to have set in once more in the opposite direction, mainly, he had no doubt, from the fact that education was more thought of in the country, and, therefore, boys and their parents believed that the profession of the schoolmaster would be one worth following. The increase of pupil teachers had been 14 per cent, as compared with 4⅓ in the previous year, and though he had not got the precise figures, there had also been an increase in the number of admissions to the training colleges, which was all the more remarkable, remembering the difficulties under which those colleges were labouring. Of the 640,000 children above six years of age who were presented for examination, 67 per cent passed without failure, and even of those who did not succeed it must not be assumed that they failed in all the branches of learning. Ninety per cent passed in reading alone, 88 per cent in writing, and 76½ per cent in arithmetic simply, figures which were all decidedly better than those attained in previous years. The Committee would see from these figures that a great work was carried on by the money voted. He should, however, be misleading the Committee if he were not to state the nature of the examination to which these children had been subjected. From the standards of examination he would take Standard 3 and Standard 6, as those might be considered the great landmarks of the examinations. Standard 3 meant "a short paragraph from an elementary reading-book used in the school." Most hon. Members took sufficient interest in schools near them to know what kind of thing the elementary reading-book in use generally was, and it was only natural that, as the Privy Council examined in these books, pupils should be trained to read with greater facility in them than they could do out of other books. Writing, according to Standard 3, meant "a sentence from the same book slowly read once and then dictated in single words." Arithmetic was defined to mean "a sum worked according to any simple rule as far as short division, inclusive." By Standard 6 was meant, as to reading, "an ordinary paragraph in a newspaper or other modern work;" as to writing, "a passage from the newspaper read over once, and then slowly dictated; and by arithmetic, a sum in Practice or Bills and Parcels." Hon. Members would doubtless agree with him that a child who had only passed Standard 3, and received no more education at school, but went home to an uneducated home, could hardly be said to have got fast hold of a knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic; while a child, on the contrary, who had passed Standard 6 might be supposed fairly to have mastered these difficulties. Now, he found that of the 640,000 children who had been examined, 480,000 were examined under Standards 1 to 3; only 160,000, or a fourth of the whole number, having been examined under Standards 4 to 6. It might be urged that those who had passed Standard 3 would naturally work on to Standard 6; but they could hardly flatter themselves that such would be the case, for neither the teachers nor the Privy Council could compel the children to remain at school. Of 1,450,000 children upon the registers, but 390,000 were over ten years of age, and the proportion of those who actually attended was, probably, still more disproportionate. He had been surprised to find that the half-timers, who were obliged by law to remain at school till thirteen years of age, made so little difference; and he believed that in debates upon the subject there must have been a tendency to exaggerate the effects of legislation, for not more than 55,000 half-timers altogether were to be found in the Government schools. He had done his best to discover how far the educational machinery provided met the actual wants of the country, and what proportion of the children of the labouring classes were brought within the scope of the aid afforded by the State. There appeared to be, according to the Registrar General's letters, about 2,000,000 children in England and Wales between six and ten years of age; and, having gone into the subject with very great care, it would be found, he thought, that in putting one-sixth of these as belonging to the children of the upper and middle classes, he was, if anything, overstating the proportion. Deducting, then, one-sixth from the total number of children in England and Wales, there would be, if the Government schools were universally used, 1,650,000 children of working people between six and ten years of age upon the books of these schools. In point of fact, however, there were only 670,000 children of that age attending the Government schools. According to the same Returns, the total number of children between ten and twelve years of age would be 930,000, which, deducting the one-sixth as before, would leave 775,000 children of the working classes between ten and twelve years of age who might be upon the books of the Government schools, there being, in point of fact, only 250,000. From the children actually upon the register, however, it was necessary to deduct one-third to get at the average attendances. The general result of this calculation would be that upon the books of the Government schools there were only two-fifths of the children of the working classes from six to ten years, and one-third of the children of the same classes from ten to twelve years of age. But of those actually receiving education there were only one-fourth from six to ten years of age, and nearer to one-fifth than one-fourth of those from ten to twelve years of age. The Registrar General had made a Return as to the number of persons who had been able to sign their marriage lines, and the progress of education had also been gauged by taking the number of boys between the ages of twelve and twenty-one who had been attending night schools, and who were able to pass examinations of the standard from No. 1 to No. 3. It was found that only one-half the boys who had so attended were able to pass in that standard. He had asked his noble Friend the Under Secretary for War to have statistics taken as to the number of recruits in Militia regiments who could read and write. Those statistics were taken in thirteen English and eight Scotch regiments. In the English regiments, of 7,506 men examined in reading, 2,360 could read well, 2,503 could read imperfectly, and 2,643 could not read at all. In writing, 8,563 were examined, of whom 1,657 could write well, 3,302 could write imperfectly, and 3,604 could not write at all. It appeared, therefore, that less than one-third could read well, and less than one-fifth could write well. The Scotch regiments were rather better. Of them, a total of 4,970 men were examined, of whom 1,839 could read well, 2,170 could read imperfectly, and 961 could not read at all; and of whom 1,128 could write well, 2,395 could write imperfectly, and 1,447 could not write at all. Scotland was not, therefore, so advanced that there was not much need of improvement. He found that in one German State—perhaps it was Saxony, the favourite State of his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), and in which it almost appeared that they educated more children than they had—the fact that four recruits out of 800 could not read was regarded as being so extraordinary that a special inquiry into the circumstance was demanded. But he did not think we were much behind the French, for he found in the Report of the French Commission on Technical Instruction, that of 323,000 conscripts 27 per cent were unable to read or write. It must be borne in mind, too, that the French conscripts, coming, as they did, from the midst of the general population, were of a better class than the English Militiamen. But as our population was a small one as compared with that of some Continental nations, we ought not to be content till we were above Continental nations in point of education. This was essential if we would maintain our position. All the children who did come to our National schools did not remain long enough in them, and there was a large number of children who did not come at all within the scope of our system. Only one-fourth of our children were helped by the Education Grant. A good deal of education was given in schools which did not receive grants; but he did not think we could rely on that. He had no wish to underrate what was done in schools outside the system; but the inspectors had been instructed to visit schools which had received aid for buildings, and which do not receive annual aid. There were Reports from most of the inspectors with reference to these schools, and certainly those Reports were not very favourable. There were three great obstacles to the complete success of our educational system. In the first place, the small rural parishes could not qualify for the receipt of aid. Next, there was a large pauper class in the large towns who did not send their children to school at all; and, lastly, there was a class who could not very well do without the labour of their children; and who, therefore, did not keep them at school for a sufficient time. He had already stated that, if the public business allowed, he hoped next Session to bring in a Bill dealing with this question. He hoped that all who could do so would assist the Government with suggestions and co-operation. A great deal was to be done; but it was also true that a great work was being done. A million of children were now obtaining substantial education, and there were 1,500,000 receiving some education. He thought, therefore, it would be most unwise to disregard what was being done under the existing system. Again, a good deal of public money was now asked for National education; but much more must be asked for if the system were to be improved. He must say that the more he looked into the matter the more he felt that it would be unkind to the hard-working, independent parent of the labouring class to relieve him altogether from the payment of fees. He did not believe the difficulty lay in the payment of fees; it lay much more in the endeavour to do without the work of the child. Having thrown out these remarks for the consideration of the Committee, he would conclude with the expression of a hope that in the prosecution of the hard task with which they had to deal the Government would continue to experience that same willingness to co-operate on the part of all classes and all sects which had led to the present results and which would eventually have the effect of rendering the system complete.

MR. WHALLEY said, that thirty years ago he sat upon a Commission which investigated the effects of legacies left for educational purposes; and they discovered that though they were successful in their immediate result they drove away independent efforts and beneficial competition. He believed that these large public grants worked to the same purpose; and they were an imputation upon the parents, with whom the education of the children naturally ought to rest.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to say a few words with reference to what was very much a matter of detail. His right hon. Friend (Mr. W. E. Forster) had very fairly stated that one of the practical difficulties which was found to exist in administering the grant was that of extending the provisions of the Educational Code to the small rural schools. He desired to invite the particular attention of his right hon. Friend when he re-handled or revised the Code to one system, which had been, to a certain extent, tried as an experiment for the advantage of some of the smaller rural schools. He alluded to that particular system which had, on the suggestion of Miss Burdett Coutts, been introduced some years ago, which had been tried at Torquay and other places throughout England, and which consisted in the grouping of small schools and the placing them under the care of an ambulatory master. Under its operation small parishes which could not afford the expense of having perfectly developed schools and trained masters were, nevertheless, able to secure the advantage of having a trained master, who visited their schools from time to time, and assisted the regular masters in managing the schools in a satisfactory manner. Now that system he regarded as a stepping-stone to bringing the small rural schools within the circle of Government aid, for there was a provision which met the case to which he was referring, and enabled the small schools, within certain limitations, to group themselves together in order to get the grant. There were, however, certain limitations as to distance and the size of parishes which prevented the experiment from being fairly tried in many instances. It was provided, for example, that a group should be within a certain distance of a national school capable of accommodating the children. The distance was measured by miles, whereas it ought not to be measured by miles but by facilities of access. He hoped that this point would not be forgotten when the Code was revised, and that the Government would endeavour so to adjust the conditions as to allow this experiment to be fairly tried.

MR. MELLY said, he hoped that this was the last occasion, or the last but one, in which the existing system of education and the present rate of expenditure would form part of the discussion in the Committee, for, as had been shadowed forth in the coming Session, a large and comprehensive scheme, bearing upon the whole country, and especially upon the neglected classes in large towns, to which he had lately drawn attention, would be introduced. He, for one, would be glad to see this Estimate very largely increased, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer need not fear any undue criticism from this side of the House when he asked for ways and means to pay for the education of their children. The education of the now neglected children at any rate will form part of the programme of Her Majesty's Government, and the appeal that has been made by the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) carries with it great weight, as showing that the case of the rural districts is nearly as lamentable as that of the great cities. In the counties of Hants, Oxford, Surrey, and Wilts there were 187 parishes, containing no less than 95,000 inhabitants, which had no certificated school at all. He found also that in East and North Devon, which the right hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote) so worthily represented, there were 195 parishes, some of which have a population of from 3,000 to 5,000 persons, and rentals of from £10,000 to £20,000 a year, in no one of which is there a certificated school. When rural districts present such complete educational destitution, when large cities admittedly swarmed with countless hundreds of young Arabs, the time had surely come when strong measures would have to be applied to settle this pressing part of the question. If they went further, they found that not only was there an absence of Privy Council schools, but practically an absence of all education whatever. The uncertificated schools were universally condemned: the attendance as irregular, the teaching as weak and inferior. Thirty-six thousand children in these schools had been examined, and the verdict was strongly against the teaching they were receiving. The Reports of the Privy Council teemed with such evidence as this—Of the 399 children with regard to whom the inquiry was made at Woodside, while 16 per cent were at work, 43½ per cent were neither at school nor at work. Again, at the Lye, out of thirty-two girls employed as nurses while the mothers make work in nail or chain shops, whom the clergyman examined, only four could read even words of one syllable. They were told that in Cambridge, Bedford, and Huntington shires, good reading was becoming very rare, and uninteresting routine was taking the place of good teaching. Again, all the inspectors but one seemed much dissatisfied with the religious teaching. In Lancashire it was described as in too many cases irreverent and wanting in decorum; in the West Riding as bare and lifeless. In Dorset and Somersetshire, however, the clergy were very active and painstaking, and they were told that the religious education was greatly improved. Such was a not unfair, though very brief, summary of the Reports of the inspectors of England and Wales. Despondency marked their tone. How could it be otherwise? There were three faults in this system, which he hoped was now passing away, to be re-placed by a more courageous, efficient, and comprehensive one. First, not only had it failed in encouraging the erection of schools in those districts which were totally destitute of education, but it positively assisted in glutting other districts of the country with new schools, which present an array of empty benches. In Worcester and Stafford shires there were 23,000 children at school, and 15,160 empty seats. In South Staffordshire 3·9 per cent of the population attended school last year, while in Germany 16 per cent attended the usual examinations. This was a fair picture of the Privy Council system—in the rural districts no schools and complete educational destitution, hundreds of children little better than savages. In almost every part of the country where there are large industrial populations—plenty of schools, and yet thousands of uneducated children. Some would have them trust to what was called Factory Act legislation; but they were told that the Factory Act actually militated against education.

> "It is a very common practice," said one of the inspectors, "for parents in manufacturing districts altogether to neglect the education of their children until they commence work—that is, until they are eight years old at least. The idea is, that then, when they are compelled to go to school, they will get schooling enough."

Thus, at a time when they were condemning their system of education, because schools were wanting in rural districts, there were actually not less than 700,000 vacant seats in the National and British and Foreign schools of England and Wales. These schools contained 2,000,000 of seats, while the average attendance was only 1,200,000 to 1,300,000 children. In the words of the Privy Council Report—

> "So far, therefore, as any common provision for the kingdom at large, or for any part of it, is accomplished by such a system, the result is accidental, and proceeds, with all the irregularity of accident, from a number of partial and isolated efforts."

Hence there was accommodation for no less than 741,032 children, and yet the existing schools were so unevenly distributed over the country that they were only two-thirds full, while some million of children in town and country attended no school at all. The second point to which, in dealing with this question, attention had not been sufficiently directed by the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council, was this — He had shown that one-third of the expenditure connected with these 1,200,000 children who do attend school was borne by the State, that one-third was borne by the parents of the children, and one-third by voluntary subscriptions. The Report which he had laid on the table showed that the subscribed cost of educating these children was £470,000 a year, and that this sum was subscribed by no more than 194,745 people: thus the education of the children of this country to the extent of one-third is carried on by a voluntary rate levied upon a very small fraction of the population, who subscribed on an average 50*s*. a head to the cause of education, and who partly educated on an average ten children a piece, in our National schools. Who were these persons? They were told in that Report that they were not the landed gentry, still less were they the farmers, who, in many instances, considered

> "That they did a favour to the rector or squire when they sent their children to the village school"—

they were not by any means the richer portion of the community in the large manufacturing towns; they were the clergy of the Established Church and the ministers of all denominations, who have taken upon themselves the education of the people of this country; and, as was well said in the Report,—

> "The uncertainty of this voluntary action is its weak side. . . On no part of the public did this uncertainty weigh more fully and onerously than on the clergy. They were the zealous representatives of the common duty,"

and thus upon them fell the cost and labour of the education of the people. They thus allowed the education of the children of England and Wales, without scheme or system, to rest upon 194,745 persons, and the large proportion of them were ministers of religious denominations, and thus they arrived, of necessity, at the position in which they found themselves. Education was made subservient to religious purposes. Fifteen schools out of sixteen are, as Mr. Lurgan said, the proprietory schools of religious denominations, while only one school out of sixteen is practically open to the child whose parents belong to no congregation or sect. Again, the new schools were erected in one place, where they were not wanted, from feelings of caprice or rivalry by some zealous person who wished to compete with or to excel some other landowner or sect; unbuilt in another place where none existed, by reason of the parsimony or lethargy of the residents, or the absence of any wealthy and public-spirited proprietor. Thus, where the demand was the greatest the supply of schools was actually the least, and where the supply was greatest there was the least demand. Again, it was an obvious fact that under such a system, in which the builder or patron of the schools was its chief, if not its whole support, the death or the removal of any of the principal supporters may be tantamount to the collapse or inefficiency of a school, and the withdrawal of the means of education from the whole district. The right hon. Gentleman said that the parents were careless of sending their children to school, or anxious to keep them at remunerative work. Why? Because they have had no education themselves, and, consequently, do not know the value of it. What is the remedy for this state of things? The remedy was to be found in the words "compulsory rating" and "compulsory attendance." Not less than eleven inspectors in the Report of 1867, and not less than seven in the Report of this year were in favour, more or less, of some compulsion.

> "What we want," writes one, "is an Act to secure to every child regular schooling for two or three hours a day, or at any rate to punish parents who are found habitually to neglect their children's education."

Again, they must give power to parishes, townships, or municipalities, to take sites for the erection of schools, just as power was now given in the case of the erection of town improvements or public buildings, or where there was an unwilling landlord to deal with in making a railway when public policy demanded it. There had been several cases where sites had been refused for schools. If it were right and legitimate to force unwilling landlords to sell land for the construction of railways, still more right and still more legitimate would it be to give such power for the purchase of sites for the erection of schools. Finally, in the language of the Privy Council's Report, so far as any education was accomplished by the present system, the result was purely accidental. But when the night was the darkest, they were nearest to the dawn: a system so freely condemned, must be near to the hour of its reform. He had very great faith in the manner in which this question would be dealt with next Session by his right hon. Friend, and he would make to him but one appeal. Let him bring in a strong and drastic measure, for the stronger the measure the more enthusiasm would it create, and the more support would be accorded to it by both sides of the House. Her Majesty's Government must have learnt this Session that the stronger the Bill they proposed, the more easy would it be to carry it.

> "Let them grasp the thistle firmly, and it would not sting."

The hostility of opponents would not be allayed by a weak and halting scheme, while the enthusiasm of adherents would only be aroused by a really strong Bill. The whole country expected, and would insist upon, thorough and complete action upon this question. It was no doubt a difficult subject; but the more courageously its difficulties were dealt with, the sooner and the easier would they be surmounted.

MR. LIDDELL said, he had heard with satisfaction the statement of the Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster), as it showed, like all the right hon. Gentleman's speeches, the great ability and industry with which he applied himself to any subject he took in hand. The right hon. Gentleman had, however, hardly succeeded—as, indeed, it was scarcely possible for him to do—in telling the House anything new on the question of education. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the chief obstacle to the general spread of education —namely, the value of children's labour. In the absence of any legislation on the subject, there were extraneous causes at work calculated to remove that evil. One of these causes was the fact, which was daily brought home to the minds of the labouring classes both in towns and agricultural districts, that the value of the labour of an educated child was far greater than that of an uneducated child. Again, the immense application of machinery in all industrial pursuits demanded the aid of an educated, rather than of an uneducated person. He concurred in the remark made by the hon. Member who last spoke, that it was upon the clergy, especially in the rural districts, that the great pressure fell in the support of education; and that was a circumstance which might reconcile to the existence of an endowed clergy some hon. Members who were not generally disposed to view the institution of an endowed clergy with favour. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council seemed to speak with some hesitation of the prospect of an Education Bill next Session. For his part, he believed that the English constituencies would be very loth to admit any excuse for not introducing an educational measure for England in the next year. With regard to an education rate, his opinion had undergone considerable change. For a long time he felt that there were great and obvious objections to such a rate—and, indeed, he still thought so; but he felt that the mass of uneducated and neglected children in the great towns had got beyond the reach of voluntary effort. He thought that no community, willing to rate themselves for educational purposes, ought to have any obstacles preventing their carrying out their wish in that respect thrown in their way; and he trusted to see a matured scheme of national education presented to Parliament early next Session, having as its basis that denominational zeal which had done so much for the cause.

MR. MUNDELLA said, he could not congratulate the House on the statement of his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster). He had himself investigated with care the Reports of the Inspectors of Schools, and he must say that anything more gloomy or disheartening it was impossible to imagine. He believed that our expenditure for National education out of the public Exchequer was greater than that of any other country in Europe; we had, in fact, the maximum of expenditure and the minimum of results. The educational grants in the United Kingdom exceeded 1*s.* per head per annum of the entire population. That was solely for primary education. But in Saxony, where all persons were instructed, and where a good, scientific, and artistic education was at the command of the poorest classes, the grant from the Exchequer, including that for the Universities and the normal schools, was under 7*d.* per head; while in Prussia, the grant was under 5*d.* per head. Our present system was exceedingly wasteful and inefficient. There was a waste of energy and power, as well as of money, and the results were most unsatisfactory. There was an average attendance of 1,000,000 in the schools in this country; but there was room for 700,000 more. All the inspectors complained of irregular attendance at the schools, which meant that the child got comparatively no education, and that those who did not attend regularly interfered with the progress of those who did. Of the children attending the inspected schools, only 8 per cent were between the ages of twelve and fourteen, which would give only about 120,000; while in Saxony, with a population of 2,300,000, 101,000 children, between the ages of twelve and fourteen, were in regular daily attendance, and had been in attendance from six years of age. With a population nine or ten times as numerous, we had only 19,000 more children in school between the ages of twelve and fourteen. Only one-fifth of the children of the working classes attended school between the ages of ten and twelve. During the Whitsuntide vacation he had visited Huddersfield, which was one of the best educated districts in England, and he found that out of 1,094 pupils, all above the age of fifteen, who had been examined and admitted into the Huddersfield Mechanics' Institute, fifty-one had never been to a day school, 357 had been to a day school for three years and under, and 686 had been to one for more than three years, while the following was the result of their attainments: — Writing — moderately, 406; badly, 486; very badly, 141; not at all, 61. Reading—well, 135; moderately, 547; badly, 237; very badly, 129; could not read, 46. A similar investigation had taken place with regard to female education, and he was sorry to say that the result was still more unsatisfactory. Throughout the country the state of female education was most defective; and how was it to be expected that women would make good wives or mothers while such a state of things continued? His right hon. Friend had referred to France, but he hoped England was not going to content herself with merely attaining the position of France with regard to education; for, with the exception of Russia, Spain, and Italy, France was behind every other nation in Europe. His right hon. Friend had alluded to two difficulties that stood in the way of the education of children. Those were, first, the necessities of the parents, and second, the neglect of the parents. It was quite true that parents could not afford to lose altogether the labour of their children; but the difficulty might be met as in Saxony, Prussia, and Switzerland, where the children were sent very early to school, and kept there regularly, before they were fit for labour, so that when the period for labour arrived they had received a pretty fair education. Afterwards, attendance was required at only one lesson a day. His right hon. Friend had invited suggestions; now, he should like his right hon. Friend, during the vacation, to send a Commission to Saxony, Switzerland, or Prussia, and ascertain how much the children earned, and how they obtained such a good education. It would not be believed till they had a blue book on the subject. He was sure that a good education might be given to children without loss to the parents, and that the result would be less crime, less pauperism, and less misery. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to bring forward a measure of education next year, and that one part of it would be to provide for a responsible Minister of Education, with a seat in that House, whose duty it would be to attend exclusively to that subject, without meddling with cattle plagues, markets, and such things.

Mr. BUXTON said, he could not agree with some of the statements of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Melly) with reference to the alleged destitution of education, particularly in rural parishes. It did not follow, because they had not a certificated master, that there were not many excellent schools. It was a delusion to talk of an utter destitution of schools because it was not considered worth while to have a certificated master. There were excellent school-houses in his neighbourhood in Surrey, and all the necessary appliances of education, provided by the kindness of the richer inhabitants, but yet the teachers were not certificated. The statement of his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster) appeared to him to prove that in every respect the present system was advancing, and advancing rapidly. It was a great mistake to suppose, because the Government system had not reached more than a certain proportion of the children, that, therefore, our educational machinery was in the like degree deficient. Still, there were shortcomings in many parts of the country, and something ought to be done to carry the system further. If possible they should move tentatively, and if the Government would only try the experiment of compulsory education in two or three large towns—Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham, for instance, where the inhabitants were prepared for it—they would obtain experience which would enable them to apply it more successfully to the country generally. He hoped the Government would take this matter into their consideration.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU wished to make a few remarks on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, who, he thought, had been, perhaps unconsciously, prepossessed with the inclination to make out a bad case for the present system of education in order to pave the way for a Bill next year. Some of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks, moreover, did not, in his opinion, prove quite so much as he appeared to suppose. There was, for instance, his comparison of the number of soldiers who could read and write in our own army and in foreign armies. That was no test of the education which was being given at the present day, but rather of that which had been given a number of years ago. It must be remembered that our system began in 1846, and made progress by very small degrees. The systems of foreign nations were established at a much earlier date. At the time our soldiers were at school, our system of education was only a germ cropping out above the ground. The right hon. Gentleman intimated that education in this country was very bad because the children passed in very low standards, and because a great number left before reaching Standard 3. That was not a test of the education of the children, but of the system of education which the State had selected. It was in consequence of a rule in the Revised Code that no child could be examined two successive years in the same standard. He would explain how this worked. It was the interest of the schoolmaster to make as much money as he could out of the children. This had been the interest of the managers also, ever since the year 1862. But now it was avowedly the object of the masters; for a practice of farming out the schools to the masters had sprung up, and was rapidly increasing. This evil practice had been noticed for some years in the Council Reports. How, then, did the master endeavour to make money out of each child? For that purpose he placed him at first as low as possible—thus, if he was as much as seven years of age he entered him on the books as six, and thus he got the first years' grant, of course, without examination, and without reference to results. The next year he would take care that the child was examined in the lowest standard; for if he were examined in a higher standard he might fail to pass the next standard in the succeeding year. Thus the child was always kept as low as possible in order that he might, without difficulty, secure the grant every year. At last he attained the age of nine years, when he must go to labour, without having passed the 3rd standard. The right hon. Gentleman himself adduced a proof in support of this argument when he admitted that the Scotch in their astuteness evaded the very thing which made our education appear worse than it really was. He was aware that the Scotch every year repudiated payment by results according to examination in the standards; so that it was not the interest of a Scotch schoolmaster to keep the scholars back. The right hon. Gentleman, in estimating the number who were receiving education, took off one-third of the children, whose names were on the registers, for non-attendance; but the proportion of those who attended he had always understood to be 76 per cent of those whose names were on the books. That was the proportion which had been given by the Royal Commissioners. According to the Estimates there were 1,060,654 children between six and ten years of age on the registers, and 978,521 in average attendance. The number of children in average attendance likewise increased enormously each year. During the past year the increase was 84,000. Again, the mode in which the average attendance was arrived at, according to the rule given in the Revised Code, was deceptive. The number of attendances was added together, and their total was divided by the number of times the school had met. No reliance could be placed upon such a mode of calculation. Suppose that four children each attended school 200 times in the year, that was equal to 800 attendances; but if the school had met 400 times, the average attendance would be counted as that of two children only. Of the poor children so attending 200 times, those who had fair abilities would pick up a decent amount of learning in the year, yet, according to the rule of computation, two of their number would be wholly ignored in the Returns. The poor, again, were necessarily a migratory population, and the children attended whatever schools happened to be nearest their temporary dwelling. According to another rule a child was not examined, and therefore would not be counted at inspection, unless his attendances, during the year, amounted to 400; yet it might have attended 200 times in each of two different parishes. It appeared that 42·3 per cent of the children were at the same school for less than a year. The great increase in the number of schools built during the past year, to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred, showed one of two things, either that a great and increasing desire for education existed throughout the year, the amount contributed by Parliament being quadrupled by local subscriptions; or else that a slight relaxation, during the year 1867-8, of the stringent provisions of the Revised Code had given a beneficial stimulus to the building of schools. This increase had taken place during the last year that he (Lord Robert Montagu) had been in Office. The excess of increase over the preceding year was, perhaps, due to the fact that the rules were interpreted with the utmost latitude that the letter of the Revised Code would allow. He would suggest that, in the building grants at least, the Department might, with advantage, allow a little relaxation. Till May 4, 1859, building grants were given at the rate of 6*s.* a square foot, counted over the area of the residence as well as of the school-room. In 1859 the allowance was reduced to 4*s.* a square foot over the area of the school-room merely; £100 being allowed for the teacher's residence. And on the 21st of January, 1860, this niggardly amount was still further cut down, the grant being reduced to 2*s.* 6*d.* a square foot for the school-room, with an allowance of £65 merely towards the residence. The cost of building a school was, as nearly as possible, £5 for every child that it was meant to contain; and as the State required an area of ten square foot per child in the school-room, the State allowance was at the rate of £1 5*s.* per child, three-fourths of the whole amount having thus to be raised locally. The same sized play-ground was required for a large and for a small school, so that the building of a small school was a much heavier charge comparatively upon the district than the building of a large one. What was the result? All large parishes and rich parishes were already well supplied with schools. Those parishes which were deficient were those, the sparseness of whose population was such that only a small school was required. It was these poor and thinly-inhabited parishes which could not come up to the Privy Council requirements. In the interests of these poor parishes, he suggested that the onerous condition as to the quantity of land might be relaxed, and the rate of allowance for the building increased. It was hard to follow all the figures which had been poured out so rapidly by the right hon. Gentleman; but he seemed to contend that there were 2,000,000 children between six and ten years of age, in England and Wales, of which one-sixth belonged to the upper and middle classes of society, and that only one-fourth of the children of the working classes between six and ten years of age, who ought to be at school, ever went there. As the hon. Member for Surrey had already pointed out, the right hon. Gentleman was speaking only of the Privy Council schools, and took no account of the numerous private schools belonging to the National Board, to large firms and factories, to rich landowners, and to private persons, all of which were not aided by the Government. There were many schools quite as good as those under the Privy Council, who either did not employ trained masters, or who, on other grounds, did not wish to submit themselves to the Privy Council rules; to most of them children of the classes mentioned had access. There were other schools so rich that they needed no Parliamentary aid, and cared not for Privy Council interference. The total number of children between three and fifteen years of age was ascertained to be 6,849,128; and without disputing the figures of the right hon. Gentleman, it certainly seemed as if 2,000,000 was a large number for those between six and ten years only. And if the numbers at reformatories, Birkbeck and factory schools, the schools belonging to religious denominations, collegiate and middle-class schools, were taken into account, there would not be left so large a margin of destitution. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of a measure which he hoped to bring forward next year to extend Government education over the whole country. He sincerely hoped that the right hon. Gentleman might be successful in bringing forward a measure that would be satisfactory to all parties, but the difficulties in the way were very great indeed. From the wording of the Report, he could perceive that the tendency of the scheme in contemplation was towards a scheme of secular education, of rating—

Mr. W. E. FORSTER begged the noble Lord's pardon. He had never used the word "rating" from beginning to end of his speech.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, the word "rating" had certainly not been used in the observations of the right hon. Gentleman; but the wording of the Privy Council Report, which he had laid upon the table, made it quite plain that the scheme was to be a scheme of rating. Those who endeavoured to introduce a rating system would find themselves obstructed by considerable difficulties. And why should it be resorted to? Because the present system had failed? It has not failed; for the intention with which it was established was not to overrun the country, but to encourage and help local voluntary effort; and in doing so it had to encounter prejudice, indifference, and labour claims. But you say, "Education does not spread fast enough by the voluntary system," and so you fly to rates to force the reluctant. What is the obstacle which you propose thereby to overcome? As had been already remarked, the chief cause of the non-advance of education was the apathy and negligence of the parents, who kept their children from school for the purpose of obtaining the money that their labour would produce. There was already more accommodation for them than they needed; but they did not go to a school, because their parents could not afford to dispense with their labour. It was hoped to meet that obstacle by rating; he contended that that would not remove the apathy or indifference of the parents in preferring the produce of the child's work to its education. The real object of those who supported the introduction of a rating system appeared to be to relieve the Consolidated Fund from the charge now incurred for the purposes of education, and to shift the burden on to the shoulders of the landowners. In his opinion, such a scheme was calculated to retard rather than advance the cause of education. If such a system were to be adopted, the clergymen who now took a great interest in the schools, and who largely subscribed towards their support with the view of increasing their flocks, would regard them with indifference when the secular system, which was inseparable from the rating system, was introduced into them. A clergyman at present did all he could to advance the school in his parish, because of the religious influence which it gave him. He looked upon the school as the nursery of his congregation, and upon all the children in it as members of his flock. But a rating system must be a secular system, just as a voluntary system must be a denominational system; for it is the governing body which determines the character of the school. The first effect of a rating system of secular education would therefore be, that the clergyman would say—"I will have nothing more to say to the school, as it will give me no more religious influence." In that way all the voluntary supervision of the clergyman, and all his efforts to get the children to the school, would be lost. The rich landowners, again, who now built and aided the schools with money, labour, counsel, and supervision, would not continue their subscriptions when they had to pay a heavy rate towards their support; and if they ceased to subscribe for a school, they would cease to patronize it, and take it under their care. Lastly, the poor man would undervalue that which was offered to him gratuitously. For a rate-supported school would be a free school; and the artizan would prefer to indulge his feeling of independence, and select and pay for the schooling of his child. The hon. Member for Sheffield had spoken of the evils of the denominational system, which rendered it necessary to send three inspectors down to a district where one would be sufficient. But though it was easy in theory to have undenominational inspection, in practice it was the most difficult thing in the world. Moreover, by doing away with the present system they would break faith with every religious body, and make all those bodies turn against them. He had reason to believe that the Vice President had not studied that long controversy on the Management Clauses. Each of the religious bodies had its special conflict with the Privy Council, and fought over every word of the Model Trust Deed under which its schools were to be settled by an irrevocable compact with the State. The duration of these conflicts was twelve years. In each case a settlement satisfactory to both parties was arrived at, and a treaty of peace was signed. The result was that deeds were framed under which each of those bodies was allowed to retain a veto upon the appointment of inspectors. Now, if only one inspector was to be sent for the inspection of a certain area, either the Government would have to select a person to fill that office who would run the gauntlet of all these vetoes, and meet with the approbation of all these various bodies—a possibility not likely to be realized in practice—or else the Government would have to break faith with the religious bodies, and set the Management Clauses on one side, and take away the power of veto on the appointment of inspectors. Nay, more; the 13,000 deeds under which the existing schools had been settled would have to be regarded as nought, and the sanctity of compacts would have to be done away with, and the faith and pledges of a Government would have to be regarded as of no value. If such a breach of faith were committed, it would be most detrimental to education by the State; for all the religious bodies would become its enemies. In conclusion, he would ask hon. Members what was the object the State should have in view in regulating the education of the country? It should be borne in mind that the State may not educate the people for the advantage of the individuals, but only for the good of the whole community. It was not the object of State education to offer commercial advantages to individuals, nor to aid them to get on in life; nor was their end merely to give men more learning; because many of our worst criminals had been persons of eminent attainments, showing that learning alone did not satisfy the needs of the State; but its object was to do that which would tend to the advantage of the community generally. The object of any education provided by the State should be to make a united and virtuous nation. But a system of secular education was not likely to bring that about. Mere secular education could not make anyone virtuous. The proper means to that end were good discipline, forming habits of self-control, sound moral education, and the restraining influences of religion. No amount of mere knowledge ever made a vicious man virtuous. Whenever an Education Bill was brought in, whoever had the charge of it, should state frankly what was the object which he had in view, and how he proposed to adapt his means to the desired end.

Mr. DIXON said, the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) had criticized not only what the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council had said, but also what he did not say. He (Mr. Dixon) regretted that the noble Lord should have ascribed the exertions of the clergy of the Church of England, with reference to the schools in their parishes, to such low and paltry motives as that of merely seeking to make converts. The noble Lord had asserted that the right hon. Gentleman had intentionally made out a very bad case, as regarded the present system, with the view of preparing the way for the Bill he intended to introduce upon the subject of education in the course of next Session. It appeared to him, however, that, on the contrary, the right hon. Gentleman had made out too favourable a case on behalf of the present system, when he stated that the progress made during the present year was greatly in advance of the progress made last year. He (Mr. Dixon) did not regard the advance in the number of pupils in the schools as being proportionate to the increase in the population. The right hon. Gentleman had founded his statement upon the number of children in the inspected schools without remembering that the increase in the number of those children did not establish that a proportionate increase had been made in the number of scholars throughout the country, inasmuch as many of these children were, in the previous year, in uninspected schools. He agreed with the noble Lord that notwithstanding the considerable increase in the Parliamentary grant of the present year towards school buildings it was still insufficient. The noble Lord appeared to him to attach too great importance to what was being done in the unaided schools. The right hon. Gentleman, towards the close of his speech, made use of a few words, at hearing which, he must confess, he was greatly disappointed, because they led him to infer that the right hon. Gentleman stood somewhat in awe of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of the Secretary to the Treasury, who occupied something like the position of dragons in reference to the national expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, great a man as he was, was not the only person to be considered in dealing with the question of education. The opinion of the country at large was of still more importance; and representing, as he did, a constituency of working men, he felt bound to tell the right hon. Gentleman that he need not have so much regard, as he seemed disposed to have, to the convenience of the taxpayers. There was a feeling growing up among the working classes in this country, which would shortly find expression on the hustings, and that was, that education was a matter of absolute and prime necessity. It was, in fact, the first point in the political creed of the new constituencies that education of the best possible character must be given, and be given quickly, to the people. All other considerations were of secondary importance; and while he by no means desired to advocate a lavish expenditure of the public money, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the working classes, who looked to the right hon. Gentleman with so much confidence, would be greatly disappointed if he were deterred from carrying out an object which they had so greatly at heart simply by considerations of finance.

MR. READ, while fully concurring in the congratulations which had been applied by the speaker who had preceded him to the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council, and expressing it to be his conviction that no money could be better laid out than that which was spent on the education of the people, said, he believed that the return from the expenditure of the present grant was proportionably more satisfactory than that which had been obtained from the outlay of a smaller sum a few years ago. As to the alleged backwardness of education in agricultural villages, owing to the fact that they possessed so few schools under Government inspection, he might mention that, in his own parish, there was a good school attended by about ninety children, and that the master having been there for nearly twenty years, there was an an indisposition to turn him adrift and obtain Government assistance by procuring the services of a certificated master in his stead. Another parish close by happened to be so divided into different hamlets that it was found better to have four separate schools than one large one. There were, in the rural districts, a considerable number of little parishes which had not the means to obtain a certificated master or mistress; but the education in many of those small schools was, he believed, satisfactory. With respect to the taunts which were thrown out as to the ignorance of the agricultural classes, he would merely observe that, so far as he could see, their children were now quite as well educated as the children of people residing in towns. He found, from what was not, perhaps, a very satisfactory test, that the number of males who were able to write their names at their marriage was greater in the agricultural districts than in towns; while, in the case of females, the comparison was still more favourable to the latter. Education, he might add, was, no doubt, a great and good thing; but he was afraid, nevertheless, that too much was, in these days, made of book-learning. It was considered, a few years ago, impossible to have an educated pauper; but we had now an educated pauper class, which was, he feared, as bad and as vicious as any class in the country. As to the number of schools, there was the great drawback, not so much that they were not numerous enough as that the attendance at them of the children was not sufficiently early and continuous. If children were sent to school young, and remained regularly until the boys were ten and the girls twelve, in the rural districts much benefit would, he thought, be the result. He had always been in favour of compulsory education to the extent that if a child could not read he should not work. He believed that, although the education given might not be entirely satisfactory, education was progressing favourably on the whole; and he hoped that if a Bill dealing with the subject were introduced next year, it would proceed not in the direction of revolution, but of substantial reform.

MR. ACLAND said, he could not help being reminded by the present state of the House of a somewhat remarkable sentiment which he heard uttered the other night in "another place," when the question raised was as to the granting of loans for education—that education was a good thing, but eating was better. In the contest which he stood at the last General Election there was no subject brought more prominently under his notice than the question of education, and he then found that there was an intense feeling on the part of his constituents against compulsory education and a compulsory rate. Now, though he was not in favour of either proposal, yet he could not consent to things being left as they were, and he was anxiously looking forward to means which might enable them to remove from this country the stigma which rested upon it, in spite of all the attempts to make matters look better by statistics of various kinds. No doubt much that had been said about the condition of education in the agricultural districts had been overstated; and he quite agreed with the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Read) that if a fair comparison were instituted between education in towns and education in the agricultural districts, it would be found to be rather in favour of the agricultural districts. At the same time, there were extensive districts in which neither the employers nor the owners of the soil were doing anything towards education, or in which the clergy were subscribing more than their fair share. The apathy, especially among the landowners, was most disheartening. He believed much of this state of things was owing to the defective state of local government; and as long as the occupiers of the soil were called upon to pay rates which they had no voice in administering, there would be an opposition to any additional rate for education. If he might, therefore, venture to touch upon another subject, he would say that he hoped the Government would withdraw their measure upon County Financial Boards for the present year, and would introduce one next year that would go much more to the root of the matter. For he was satisfied that in this great work of education the House must look not only to the clergy and the landowners—and he must admit they had not got much from the latter—but also to the employers of labour and the parents of the children. Children were not to be educated by a sort of prescription, issued by the State physician, with directions to apply to the nearest shop for education. Unless the parents were educated we should never have an educated people, at least in the agricultural districts. He would be glad to learn that the Government intended to employ the inspectors, during the course of the Recess, in a district inspection. At present they spent a good deal of money in sending perhaps three inspectors to one district to visit the National, the Roman Catholic, and the British schools; he trusted inspectors would be sent to the surrounding districts, where there were no aided schools; and it would be found, perhaps, that some of these were better than they thought, while others, he feared, were worse than it was possible to imagine. He would also suggest it as a subject for consideration whether they were not proceeding upon too rigid and uniform a system, applying the same system of education to thinly-peopled districts as to large towns. In the former there should be small schools; at least he knew that in West Somerset and North Devon there were districts where they must have small schools if they were to have any education at all. He hoped the House would excuse him for going into these details; but he felt that they were not so much discussing the Estimates provided for this year, as they were feeling their way to a large and comprehensive measure for next year. For himself, he fully appreciated the great efforts that had been made by the friends of the denominational system; and he hoped this House would not fall into the mistake committed by the Education Minister of the last Government (Lord Robert Montagu), who attributed those efforts to a narrow sectarianism. He had no fear that the present Government would fall into the mistake of the noble Lord. In their Cattle Bill, as well as in other measures, they had exhibited a spirit that was truly liberal—that was to say, they had shown a disposition to govern, not for the people, but through the people; and they appreciated the necessity of carrying the people with them in all their measures. He thought he might also congratulate the House on the fact that it was now admitted that a sound religious education might be given while the religious rights of others were respected, and that the resistance to the Conscience Clause would no longer form a barrier in the way of national education.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, the Returns showed that in the country there were 2,700,000 children under ten years of age, and 2,400,000 between ten and fourteen. Now, the difficulty in securing for the poor a substantial and lasting education was in the irregular attendance of children after they were ten years old—up to which time what was learnt was learnt mechanically, and was not remembered—or in their removal from school altogether, in order that by their work they might contribute to the support of the family. The result at present was that one-third of those under ten were on the school books, but only one-sixth of children over ten. He did not believe that any education would be effectual until the older children were, to a certain extent, subsidized by the State—say that, in addition to the allowance to the schools, 1*s.* 6*d.* a week was given to each child. It was a lamentable fact that of the 2,400,000 children between ten and fourteen, there were only 388,000 who presented themselves for examination, and that of the children that were brought under examination the half did not remain at school more than one year. It appeared that while £560,000 was spent on education proper, £90,000 was spent on the machinery, and he would suggest that a considerable saving for the purposes of a State subsidy might be effected by localizing the inspectors, whose salaries were £36,000, and personal expenses over £32,000 a year. In Ireland a large number of the inspectors were localized, and the result was that their personal expenses were small. In the county in which he lived they had no lack of schools, and the landlords, the clergy, and the tenants were all willing and anxious to encourage education as far as they could, but the difficulty was to get the children to come to the schools. A species of bribe, in the shape of school treats and excursions, was there held out to induce the children to attend for the number of days that was necessary to admit them to the examinations. He believed that local inspectors, who knew something of the character of particular districts, and could discriminate between the agricultural and the town populations, would do better than inspectors sent from head quarters; and the saving that might be effected in the salaries of the latter class of officers would enable them to offer a small grant of 1*s.* 6*d.* per head or so for every child over ten or eleven years of age who had attended school for a certain number of days in the year. Some slight incentive of that kind would, he believed, tend to counteract the temptation which poor parents were under to accept any amount of employment for their children instead of keeping them at school. Its working would, he thought, be satisfactory, and it would give a permanence to education which was now greatly wanting.

Mr. BAINES said, he could assure the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney) that the majority of children attended school for much more than a year. They might not attend the same school all the time, but their gross average of attendance was greatly above a year; he believed it was more than five years. He wished to offer his tribute of thanks to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) for his able speech and for the judicious views he had expressed on the subject of education. In the very populous districts with which both he and the right hon. Gentleman were connected the sentiment on behalf of popular education was universal. The extreme apathy and great prejudice which formerly existed in reference to that question had entirely vanished; and but one feeling now prevailed,—namely, that every child in the country ought to receive education; although how that end was to be attained was, no doubt, a matter of considerable difficulty. The recent extension of the suffrage supplied a strong argument for a wider diffusion of the benefits of education. He believed that the limits of the elective franchise far exceeded the limits of education, and the safety and honour of the country demanded that such a state of things should be corrected. Still, great progress had been made within the present century in the spread of popular education. At the commencement of this century the education of the people in England was most deplorably neglected. In 1818, the number of scholars in daily attendance was only 674,000, and, in 1858, it had risen to upwards of 2,500,000. A pamphlet issued by the National Society, the other day, proved a most triumphant case for that society; and, as one who did not belong to that institution, he was happy to render the tribute of his admiration to the immense efforts in the cause of education made not only by the clergymen connected with it, but also by their congregations; and he should conceive the abstraction of their energies from the work of education to be one of the greatest calamities which could possibly happen. In 1831, the number of scholars in daily attendance in Church schools under the cognizance of the National Society was only 380,248; in 1837, it was 470,188; in 1847, it was 955,865; in 1857, it was 1,187,086; and, in 1867, the number had increased to upwards of 1,505,856; and including night schools, but excluding dames' schools, the number was 1,654,437. Since 1830 there had been a sixteen-fold increase in the circulation of periodicals, newspapers, and other works of popular literature. He trusted, therefore, that his right hon. Friend would have great encouragement and good materials to work upon when he should produce his plan next year. He had a strong conviction that by the extension and improvement of the half-time system of labour and schooling a great deal might be done in the agricultural districts. His hon. Friend the Member for Devon (Mr. Acland) and the hon. Member for Norfolk (Mr. Read) had said what was quite true, that many of the agricultural districts were ahead of the manufacturing in regard to the numbers who were being educated. Mr. Paget, the late Member for Nottingham, had originated a system for the children on his estate which had worked most admirably, and he had told him (Mr. Baines) that the labourers were much more valued now that they were educated than they were before. Mr. Paget's was a half-time system, not precisely a half-day, or half-week, or half-month system, but a system which enabled children to continue their profitable labour, and to remain under education to a much more advanced age than they would otherwise be able to do. There was a large number of children in this country who went to school for four or five years, but who afterwards forgot not only writing but reading too. And here he would wish to pay his tribute of respect and acknowledgment to the zeal with which the late Government attended to the representations which he, for one, had made for the extension of the grants to schools, which by the original conditions of the Privy Council were excluded. There was a class of schools, especially those of the Nonconformists, who were most anxious to have religious education given along with secular; but, owing to their principles, they would not take Government money which seemed to be given for the teaching of religion. They therefore abstained for a long time from receiving any Government grant for the schools. At length—and he must confess himself to have been one of those who had undergone conversion — they had come to the belief that they might, in consistency with their principles, take the money for secular education, while they supplemented it by giving religious education themselves. The noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) and the noble Lord opposite (Lord Robert Montagu) met him in the most frank spirit, and the noble Duke introduced a Bill in the other House to enable the Privy Council to make grants to all schools that gave secular education, provided they made it plain to the inspectors that the secular education was good. And here he would say that he attached the greatest possible value to the system of inspection. He believed the two main conditions of success were—first, the excellence of our inspection—the ablest men being sent to do the work; and, secondly, the perfect liberality with which all religious denominations were treated. He was glad to see the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) and the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles Adderley) present, both of whom, he was happy to acknowledge, had displayed the same enlarged spirit of liberality. He thought that if they extended their grants to the smaller schools in the country which found a difficulty in meeting the present requirements of the Government, the results would be most beneficial. He trusted also that permissive powers would be given to communities like Birmingham, which were desirous to have the power of rating themselves in order to supplement that education which was at present neglected. He was not opposed to secular education where no other system was practicable; but he hoped we should never see a system established in this country from which religion should be compulsorily excluded. How was it possible that where, under the National Society alone, 1,500,000 children were taught, we could think of introducing a system of that sort? He was sure that other denominations in this country would be found as zealous in promoting religious instruction, and it was that which formed the character and the man. By all means, then, let us have fair play for the religious element, and then he trusted that, by the combination of secular with religious instruction, all the children in this country might receive a full education.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE said, he was most anxious to see every child in the country, no matter what his condition in life, educated—at all, events, to a certain extent. He believed the country to be extremely deficient in the matter of education. But he thought there were one or two points deserving of consideration before the introduction of any measure on the subject. He agreed with the suggestion which had been thrown out relative to the appointment of a Commission to ascertain the several systems in operation in different countries, so as to form a basis for future legislation in this country, and thought it might be desirable to try some experiments in our larger towns, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it might not be possible to reach one class which had scarcely been touched by any class of educationalists. Large numbers of children were known to the State only through the policeman and the magistrate, and if left uncared for they would develop into habitual thieves, harmful to themselves and to all with whom they had to do. It was better to spend money in educating such children than in maintaining gaols for their reception. He could not help thinking that much more might be done by the extension of the half-time measure, and an alteration in the mode of carrying it out, and would suggest that half the week should be spent at work and the other half at school, instead of spending one-half of each day at work and the other half at school.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he was sorry to cut short a debate which had proved so fruitful of suggestion; but it rather bore upon a question not before the House. It indicated pretty clearly, however, the kind of measure both sides of the House wished to see introduced as early as possible. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines) in his remark with regard to the extension of the Government grant to secular schools; but, while admitting the liberality of the late Government on the subject, observed that the whole matter had been postponed in the belief that a general measure would be introduced next year. The hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had proposed a Commission to the Continent. If in existence, the Report of such a Commission would be no doubt useful. But as it was the duty of the Government to be ready with a Bill next Session, they must set to work upon it immediately, and there was really no time to wait for more information, which, in truth, was not needed. The difficulty was, not to obtain knowledge of the existing state of things, but how to meet the difficulties which beset the question on every side. Referring to what he had said respecting militiamen and young men who had left school eight or ten years, his noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu) seemed to infer that he was attributing the facts to the operation of the Revised Code; but it was the old system and not the new one which was responsible for them, as they were the result of a state of things which existed before the Revised Code came into operation. It was his own opinion that there had been a decided improvement within the past few years, and he doubted whether five or six years hence a similar Return respecting boys who had left school would be so unsatisfactory. He was sorry to say that one-third must be deducted from the register to get at the average attendance. He wished success to the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon) in his efforts to induce the tax-payer to care little what sum was paid for taxation, but the Government must consider not merely the feelings of those who would willingly tax themselves, but the feelings of the whole population, including those who were not earnest in the cause of education. He had reason to hope that throughout the country less and less importance was being attached to the mere question of money, but they must still expect difficulties to arise from that source. Under any system he believed it would be unwise to relieve parents of the one-third which they now paid, because they could not be safely relieved of their responsibility for their children. It was not to the interest of the cause of education to relieve parents of their liability, because success must depend largely upon their co-operation. Nor did he wish to get rid entirely of the large sums contributed for educational purposes by benevolent persons. It was true the acceptance of their aid involved some disadvantages, such as too many schools in some places and too few in others; yet they brought to bear an amount of zeal and interest which no one who had the cause of education at heart would utterly refuse, but would rather seek to make the best of, and, if necessary, to supplement. The Government had the subject of education under consideration; but at present they had come to no definite plan or scheme upon the subject, and it was unadvisable then to say anything in reference to it other than that the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) in what he had stated had merely given the Committee his inferences from the Report, and he ventured to add, with very little ground for making these inferences. He wished, however, to remind the Committee that an educational rate did not necessarily imply free schools. As the half-time question had been frequently alluded to, and could not escape the attention of any Government, he would say that the result of his experience was that in the textile fabric manufactures there was great advantage in having children at school half the day, and at work the other half; but how to apply half-time to other employments, and particularly to agriculture, was one of the most difficult of questions. Undoubtedly the rule which answered in the case of the textile fabrics might utterly fail in that of agricultural labour. No one was more sensible than he was of the difficulties which surrounded the question of education, but he felt, as he believed Government would feel, encouraged by the tenor of the discussion that evening.

Mr. E. POTTER said, he thought justice had hardly been done to one part of the question, and that was this—there was a large part of the population who could not afford to pay for the education of their children, and who must, therefore, be dependent upon the State. He did not believe that any measure would do the good required unless it involved the State in considerable outlay for the classes too ignorant to appreciate education, and too poor to pay for it. He would not on any account meddle with the present system; the object was to reach a class whom the present system did not touch; and that could not be done without resorting to compulsion, which was eminently unpopular with the working classes. It was not merely the school pence, but the loss of the earnings of their children, which would weigh with persons whose wages averaged 15*s*. or 16*s*. a week; and, having regard to these things, he feared that any measure which did not embrace free schools would be an abortive one.

Colonel SYKES said, that the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster) at the commencement of his remarks had spoken rather depreciatingly of the Scotch system of education, but he (Colonel Sykes) begged to state that there was no country in the world, not even excepting Prussia, where compulsory education had been adopted, where so large a proportion of the people could read and write. Lord Advocate Gordon stated in the House of Commons that 1 in 20·5 of the population in Scotland attended schools; 1 in 24·9 in Prussia; and only 1 in 50·7 in France. What was taught in the parochial schools of Scotland was not merely the "three R's." He held in his hand the reports made by the inspectors of forty-five parochial schools in Aberdeenshire, which he had shown to his right hon. Friend; and from these it appeared that the education given there included English, English grammar, English composition, writing, arithmetic, geography, mathematics, Latin, and Greek, and in one school at Elgin thirteen boys were learning French. Teaching the "three R's" was not imparting education. They were only a means to an end. They were only what knives and forks were to a dinner. In the parochial schools in Scotland the enlarged teaching was owing to 76 per cent of the teachers having received a University education, the numerous small bursaries and moderate fees enabling persons of humble origin to qualify themselves as superior schoolmasters. Here, in London, the Lord Chief Baron, in charging the grand jury the other day, stated that twenty-two out of the twenty-four prisoners could neither read nor write. He agreed with the hon. Member who had last spoken that there were families who could not afford to educate their children, and who, therefore, regarded State assistance as a necessity. He looked upon night schools as being of the greatest advantage to the labouring classes, by keeping up and increasing the little knowledge acquired in early youth.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £158,253, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he would make a short statement in reference to this Vote. It was to complete the sum of £232,223, which seemed an apparent increase on the previous year's Estimate of £13,423; but of that amount £12,991 was merely the re-vote in consequence of the winding up of the Paris Exhibition, and the real increase on the Vote was only £432. The sums applicable to institutions other than those in London were—for the Edinburgh Museum, £7,347; for the Dublin institutions, £14,979; and for the Geological Survey, £20,500; making a total of £42,826. Of the £189,427 remaining, £9,103 was required for the central office, £26,100 for aid to science schools, £32,150 for aid to art schools, £3,000 for preparing papers, £6,660 for inspection and examination, £3,000 for travelling, £600 for sundries, and £2,000 for the reproduction of objects of art for the use of the provinces, £2,515 for the School of Naval Architecture, £10,463 for the School of Mines and Geological Museum, and £750 for the College of Chemistry. Of the remaining £93,086, £24,000 was for the new building for the Museum and School of Science at South Kensington, and £3,000 for that at Bethnal Green, being a decrease of £8,500 under the first head, and of £4,000 under the second. Of the remaining £66,086, £41,439 was for the expenses of the South Kensington Museum, and £24,647 was for purchases. Those sums included £8,647 for purchases from the Paris Exhibition, as well as £4,344 for furniture, being both of them mere transfers from previous Votes. Thus the total sum expended upon the management of the South Kensington Museum was £37,095, and upon purchases £16,000, making together a total of £53,095. He had stated the Estimate in this way because he wished to dispel the impression that the South Kensington Museum monopolized the great part of the Vote, and he had shown that only a small part of the expense was incurred for that institution. As it was said that this was a case of London against the provinces, he would observe that a considerable number of pictures in the South Kensington Museum were circulated in the provinces, and the museum itself was visited by persons who came from the country nearly as much as by residents in the metropolis. The museum was becoming more and more appreciated every year. In 1868, 103 Art schools were aided, as against ninety-eight in 1867, and the scholars in them in 1868 numbered 18,475, as against 17,341 in 1867. The night schools had increased in much greater proportion. In 1868, they amounted to 130, as against seventy-two in 1867; and in these night schools the number of scholars was 4,571 in 1868, as against 2,553 in 1867. There was also an increase in the numbers of the schools for the poor in which drawing was taught. They amounted in 1868 to 778, as against 588 in 1867; and the scholars learning drawing were 93,713 in 1868, as against 79,411 in 1867. He had therefore to ask for a considerable increase on the Art Estimate—namely, £5,000, from £27,150 in 1868, to £32,150 in 1869; and he was happy to say that he had to ask for a much larger proportionate increase in science—namely, from £18,900 last year, to £26,000 this year. He would compare the state of things in May, 1869, with their condition in 1868, because so much attention was now paid throughout the country to the subject of science, that science schools and scholars were increasing every day in number. In May, 1869, there were aided 509 science schools—separate institutions—as against 300 in May, 1868. The separate classes in different sciences in May, 1869, were 1,500, as against 789 in 1868. The students under instruction in May, 1869, were 25,000, as against 15,000 in May, 1868. In the last May examination the papers worked were 24,085, as against 13,112 in May, 1868; and the number of students who went up for examination in May, 1869, was 13,000, as against 6,800 in May, 1868. Those figures showed that a very great increase had occurred under all those heads, and if the increase went on in the same proportion, it would, while being very much felt in the Estimates, show that a great desire for scientific education was taking hold of the population, for the money voted was so much assistance given exclusively to the artizan class. This had been referred to by Professor Huxley, in an article in *Macmillan's Magazine,* who said that the effects of these schools would be very great. He had acted as examiner under the system, and he expected not to have less than 2,000 sets of answers mainly from the artizan class, while other examiners were likely to have three or four times the number of papers. While quoting Professor Huxley, he must, however, add that he stated, in his evidence before the Committee last year, that the time was come when it would be of advantage to have some kind of training for the teachers in science. He must call the attention of the Committee to the position of our higher schools in London. We had four schools, one for art and three for science. He dared say that hon. Members would be surprised to hear how very little the Art School at South Kensington cost the country. The grant for that school was £3,900, as against £4,600 last year, and of that amount the sum of £2,000 was for the maintenance of students from local schools. The remainder was a payment to the masters. Of the three science schools, one was the School of Naval Architecture, for which he asked this year, £2,515. It was established by the Duke of Somerset for the education of young men from the Royal Dockyards, and also for private dockyards, and to a great extent it was self-supporting. Another was the School of Chemistry, which was an excellent school and very well taught, but which was very much hampered from the want of room. The grant required for that school was £750. The third was the School of Mines and Geological Museum in Jermyn Street, for which he asked this year £10,063, as against £12,003. That sum of last year was necessary in consequence of the special expenses required in the shape of buying leases. This school had been alluded to as merely an institution for teaching mining; but that was not the case, as it was, in fact, a most excellent school of science, and had connected with it some of the best Professors in the country, such as Professor Tyndall, Professor Huxley, and Dr. Percy. These three schools were scattered over different parts of London, and undoubtedly there would be a great advantage in bringing them together, and forming them into one school of science, which might be used as a training school for masters. Of the £25,000 now asked for completing the buildings at South Kensington, not more than one-half would go to the museum, and at least another half ought to go to the school of science.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR: Sir, I am glad that the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. Samuelson) has directed our attention to the important question of Science instruction in this country. I need not remind the House in detail of the various public recognitions which it has already received. After the French Exhibition of 1867, the Schools Inquiry Commission issued circulars to the leading English jurors who had served on that Exhibition; and their united testimony was that England is not holding her own in the industrial progress of nations, but that other nations, by increased attention to science, are making rapid advances which must soon enable them to run equal with, if not to pass, this country in the race of industry. The nation was, undoubtedly, much moved by this report, and public national conferences were held in London, Edinburgh, and in the leading provincial towns, to consider a question so grave to our interests as an industrial country. At all of those resolutions were passed calling upon the Government to promote education in science throughout the country, and to give inducements for the foundation of special technical institutions in the chief centres of industry. The Government at that time quickly responded to this public feeling, and issued instructions to our Ambassadors and consuls abroad to report on the state of scientific instruction among the people of foreign States. They also accepted the offer of my hon. Friend the Member for Banbury, to visit the leading technical institutions on the Continent, and to report his impressions, valuable from his large manufacturing experience. The House also appointed a Select Committee to examine the whole subject, and their Report has been for some time before it. The Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire took a large and statesmanlike view of this important question. We are told in the evidence of the then Vice President of the Council (Lord Robert Montagu), and of the officers of the Department of Science and Art, what were the views entertained by that Government. They saw that in this country there were few opportunities of learning science of the highest class in its bearings on productive industry, and they wisely considered that it would be better to develop existing institutions — such as University and King's Colleges in London, the Owen's College in Manchester, the Universities in Scotland, and the Queen's Colleges in Ireland — rather than to create a large number of new institutions. In all of these there are courses of science fitted for general education, and which could be developed at small cost. But while proposing to use these materials, the then Government saw that a few institutions of a more technical kind might be required, and they admitted the urgent need of training teachers in science, so as to supply secondary schools throughout the country. A draft Minute to this effect was under consideration by the late Government when they went out of Office, and the power was transferred to this side of the House. The Liberal Government, which now succeeded, was naturally looked to as certain to see the gravity of this question, and to sympathize with the wants and wishes of the industrial classes. But the difficulties in its way were great, for there was an urgent necessity for contracting the expenditure of the nation; and the efforts necessary for accomplishing large retrenchments are not favourable for projects involving increased expenditure, even when they relate to a productive purpose. While these fully justify any delay in meeting the public demands, they do not justify a reversal in the policy of the previous Government, if that policy were founded on justice and wisdom. That Government had indicated their intention to aid local efforts, when these were fully and clearly made. They were no doubt largely influenced in this policy by finding that the cry for science instruction was not made by mere theorists, but that men of high manufacturing eminence, like Whitworth, Sir David Baxter, and James Young, were willing to contribute munificently to its advancement. In consequence of this policy, local efforts were made. The men of Glasgow subscribed more than £100,000, and met a response from the Government. The men of Manchester followed their example, and subscribed £13,000 for a Chair of Engineering in the Owen's College, and £54,000 for building a new one, fitted to be a great technical institution. They naturally believed that Government would meet them half-way, as they had done in the case of Glasgow. They were justified in their hopes, for they had proved the existence of a real want in the fact that the Owen's College had 350 students at science classes during the day, and 200 in the evening. With aid from the State, a high technical College might have been erected in one of the most important of our industrial centres. But the manufacturers of Manchester were discouraged by the Government, which held out no hopes of present or of future aid. I refer to this case, because I believe that the policy of the late Government was a wise, one when they proposed to supplement existing action and to develop existing institutions, rather than to create new ones solely dependent on the State. The reply that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will probably give is, that if Manchester desires technical instruction, she ought to provide it solely at her own expense, and without coming to the State for aid. If the State have no duties in promoting manufactures and commerce, and in removing the obstacles which impede their development, this answer would be satisfactory; but no one can surely contend that the State can neglect such duties with safety to the country. No one knows better than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), how backward our secondary education is in all matters relating to Science and Art. In his celebrated speeches at Edinburgh and Liverpool, he pointed out how profoundly the secondary education of the country requires alteration. No doubt, a large and important step has been made in England by passing the Endowed Schools Bill through both Houses. If this Bill be well worked, and if the Commission to which it is intrusted fully understand the importance and the responsibilities of their duties, an immense impulse may be given to the study of Science and Art in this country. But this is not enough. It has been well said that "every true science bears necessarily within itself the germ of a cognate profession." But then these germs require development in the soil of Technical Colleges or of Universities with Technical Chairs, and every country except our own has already founded, or is actively engaged in founding, schools for such development. The hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. Samuelson) has alluded to the importance of our creating a College of Science for the training of teachers, and I quite agree with him. But while we are only talking, France has done it. I hold in my hand a letter which the Minister of Public Instruction has done me the honour to address to me, explaining the nature of the new Normal School at the Hotel Cluny, and proposing a system of international change between the science teachers of England and France, so that they might learn the language and the technical wants of both countries. I am ashamed to reply that England has no science teachers in training, and that we cannot profit by his wise proposal. Perhaps the Government may consider itself justified in resting on the action of the Department of Science and Art for diffusing a knowledge of science among the working classes. I do not under-rate their action, and see with pleasure the rapid growth of scientific studies among the working classes of this country. Last year 25,000 persons have been encouraged to some knowledge of elementary science, through this Department. The Government have intrusted to it a sort of scarifier to scratch the surface of the soil, but no plough to go deeply into it, so as to ensure the growth of any crops. We have two educational departments of the Privy Council, running side by side on parallel rails, but never touching each other for fear of a violent collision. This is not for the benefit of the public. If the Department of Science and Art is to fulfil its mission, it ought to extend its benefits to the elementary schools of this country. A few evenings since, I had occasion to tell you that three centuries of experience in Scotland had convinced us that higher subject, introduced into primary schools, gave to them a life and ambition which re-acted powerfully on the higher education of the people. I also pointed to the fact that England was the only civilized State in Europe which limited instruction in the primary schools to "the three R's." Until you make a coherent organization of the Educational Departments, so that they act in harmony and co-operation, the diffusion of science will only be slight and partial. When the taste for science has permeated the elementary schools, mechanics' institutions and the like will rise into efficient secondary schools for the industrial classes, though higher schools than these are required to train foremen and managers who will enable this country to hold its own against foreign competition. The Department of Science and Art is showing a disposition to aid provincial schools, and an extension of its benefits necessarily leads to increased Estimates. I shall read to you the views of a great statesman on this point, in a speech delivered in 1862, in reference to the Estimates of that year—

> "It was complained that this Vote was increasing. That was the very merit of it. If the principle was a wrong one, let it be altered. But as long as they adhered to the rule laid down, there was a necessary increase, especially in the provisions for the circulation among the country schools of examples of Art."

The statesman who then wisely and sagaciously, as I think, saw merit in increasing Votes when the expenditure is productive, is now Chancellor of the Exchequer. But under his rule I regret to find this very Vote, which he so strongly commended, altogether vanished from the Estimates. Last year, a Minute of the Committee of Council was issued to provincial schools, promising them a participation in the art-treasures of London. This was, no doubt, in deference to the Report of a Select Committee of this House in 1864, which recommended—

> "That the collection of works of decorative Art at South Kensington be made more generally useful than at present throughout the country, especially in connection with local museums."

Accordingly, a sum of £14,000 appears in last year's Estimates for this purpose, though the full amount does not appear to have been asked for; but this year the Vote for this important object has vanished altogether. I need not remind the House that expenditure is of two kinds — unproductive and productive. While we should be jealous as to the increase of the one, we should encourage the increase of the other. If you do not sow, neither will you reap. One of the most economical nations of Europe —Switzerland—understands this fully, and in some of the leading cantons spends one-third of the whole taxation on education. She was forced to this large expenditure because she was cut off from the raw material of industry. Switzerland has to send to Belgium for coal, or to Saarbruck in Germany, or to St. Etienne in France, and yet she thrives as an active manufacturing nation. She does so because she has recognized the fact that, in the progress of the world, the value of the raw material in manufactures, as an element of production, is constantly decreasing, while the value of science, skill, and knowledge, is as constantly increasing. Let us contrast the position of Switzerland with Ireland. The latter is much nearer the sources of all raw material, and is locally more fitted to be an industrial nation than Switzerland, yet her only manufacturing industry is that of flax. It is true that the selfish protective policy of England has crushed her attempts at industrial development. We stamped out her woollen and leather manufacture, then crushed, as they arose, hopeful industries, in silk, cotton, sugar, soap, and candles. Well, we have long since repented of these national crimes; but, if we would atone for them, let us give to Ireland those means of acquiring knowledge which will far more than compensate for her lack of the raw materials of industry. The people of Ireland are showing more disposition than the people either of England or Scotland to study science, for they see that without it there is little hope for their future. Let us encourage this growing taste wisely and liberally. We have done this year a great act of justice to Ireland, and next year you will doubtless improve the laws in regard to the tenure of land. But unless you open up channels of industry to conduct off the increasing population, that will flow back upon the land as it has done in times past, and again drown the prosperity of Ireland. England and Scotland, blessed with the raw material of important industries, may, without advanced technical education, continue for some time to compete with the more highly educated countries of the Continent, but Ireland cannot. Her only hope is that the skill, science, and intelligence of her people, as in Switzerland, may compensate for her local disadvantages. A great statesman, Sir Robert Peel, long since warned us of the danger then looming in the distance, but now much nearer, when he said—

> "If we are inferior in skill, knowledge, and intelligence to the manufacturers of other countries, increased facilities of intercourse will result in transferring the demand from us to others."

This is the kernel of the whole matter. Our peculiar system of education, limited chiefly to the ancient tongues, has now put our middle and higher classes in this position. If you think we can wait till this rights itself, without any stimulating action on the part of the Government, then inaction will be justified in your eyes. Yet even then it must remain remarkable that all the great industrial States of Europe and America are giving their energies and their treasures to the advancement of technical education, while we are practically doing nothing. I freely admit that our difficulties are greater than theirs. We already spend much more on educational objects from Imperial taxation than any other Continental State. This is owing to the fact that primary education in foreign countries is supported by local taxation. Their general taxation is applied to secondary and higher education, while with us it is mainly applied to primary schools. Our efforts consequently appear large, while the results attending them are uncommonly small; their efforts, as measured by taxation, appear small, but the results are large and important. Hence, as regards our Chancellor of the Exchequer, the difficulty of a large and vigorous action is great, for the burden of Imperial taxation for educational objects is already heavy in appearance as compared with other countries, though not so in reality, for local taxation does not appear in the Budget of a nation. The only remedy is to economize the unproductive expenditure, and thus obtain funds for that which is productive. We have a strong Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a strong Government from whom large economies have already resulted. Let us hope that these will soon enable them to consider this question in that spirit of wise liberality which I think it deserves. Much wiser men than myself see the danger of delay. A few weeks since, Dumas, formerly Minister of Commerce in France, said in the theatre of our Royal Institution—

> "Science is no longer an unrecognized power. To-day, every Government which does nothing for it must expect to be vanquished by rivals, and to receive the censure of posterity for its want of forethought."

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, that he considered it his duty to challenge the impartiality of these Estimates. A sum of £130,000 was granted for Universities, Colleges, learned societies, museums, and for kindred purposes. Of this sum England received £36,000, Scotland, £46,000, and Ireland, £48,000, including in this latter sum grants to the Queen's Colleges. In the great manufacturing districts of the North of England, whose population was counted by millions, and of which Manchester might be regarded as the centre, not one shilling of the public money was spent in the support of any institution whatever. If that exclusion was to be kept up, he thought there ought to be a satisfactory defence for it. It could not be pretended that none of the public money was given to these manufacturing districts on the ground that they were better educated than the rest of the United Kingdom. The population of Lancashire and the adjoining counties had been too much absorbed in business pursuits to allow their education to keep pace with other matters. Whatever they might boast of, they did not boast that they were better educated than their neighbours. The Government could not refuse them assistance on the ground that there was no special channel through which that assistance might be conveyed. Owen's College in Manchester, was founded twenty years ago by a merchant who left £100,000 for that purpose. It started with sixty-two students; it had now 210. At the commencement twenty-eight persons attended the night lectures in the institution; the number of persons who now attended them was 473, The College had a staff of Professors inferior to that of no other institution. The building was inadequate to accommodate more students, and there was a scheme on foot to extend it. It was proposed to raise £150,000, of which nearly £90,000 was absolutely collected. It was only fair and reasonable that the Government should do something, because the late Government had given £120,000 to Glasgow. Manchester would think itself fortunate if it got half this sum, the payment of which might be spread over four or six years. But when they asked for help, they were told that London, Edinburgh, and Dublin were capitals — a comfortable doctrine for the inhabitants of those cities. It should, however, be remembered that a provincial town received more benefit from £20,000 spent within it than it received indirectly from an outlay of £100,000 in the capital. Glasgow was not a capital, but they were told it had a University, and that Manchester had only a College. But a College was sometimes better than a University; and, besides, Owen's College would one day become a University, and all the sooner if it received a fair measure of assistance from the Government. There were a good many Universities and Colleges that received aid in the United Kingdom besides those of the capitals. The people of Manchester made no complaint of the assistance given to the Scotch Universities; but they felt that the extension of the system to their own district would be highly beneficial, for at present the Scotch, with their admirably managed parochial education, supplemented by instruction at the Universities, carried nearly everything before them. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had behaved somewhat harshly towards the people of Lancashire in this matter, and implied that there was a want of self-respect on their part, in coming to London to seek for pecuniary aid to local effort. He wished to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that Owen's College was not intended for the sons of the wealthy, but for those of small tradesmen, and of professional men of small means, and that even working men from Oldham were known to attend the evening classes. One-fifteenth part of the £130,000 to which reference had been made was paid by Lancashire, and he wished to know what loss of self-respect on their part was involved in asking for a portion of the general fund to which they so handsomely contributed. He was not certain that the reputation for wealth which Lancashire enjoyed had not stood in the way of their obtaining what they needed. Lancashire, undoubtedly, had been a wealthy county, and, he believed, would be so again; but the present was a time of failing fortunes and great commercial difficulty, and Lancashire, accordingly, was much poorer now than she was ten years ago. The First Minister of the Crown, of course, knew that in his native county the evening Science classes had been more successful than in any county in England; but what became of all the young men who studied in those classes? In the earlier part of the evening, the Vice President of the Council had spoken of children receiving elementary instruction who, after passing the third standard, went away and forgot everything which they had learnt, not having gone far enough. And so it was with the young men attending these science classes; they wanted to be gathered into Owen's College and carried further in the path of instruction, and with some moderate assistance from the State this could be accomplished. No doubt, there was a difficulty in knowing where the Government was to draw the line. But he would say let them require conditions, such as existed at Owen's College, before giving State assistance; let there be an adequate population, an institution already past the experimental stage, and a large amount of local gifts, and the Government then need never fear that the public purse would be unduly invaded. The population of Manchester was precisely of that class in the midst of which it was desirable that a learned community should grow up, and he trusted that another year would see them better treated in this respect. He was expressing, he knew, the feelings of many hon. Members when he declared that it ought to form a part of the national policy to encourage real and earnest efforts at improvement such as Manchester had made in this case.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he thought that the constituencies of England—recalling the speeches made by those who sat in that House, and who tried to get into that House, last November, as to the vital importance of the question of education—would have been surprised could they have looked into the House half-an-hour ago, when barely a quorum of Members were present.

MR. GLADSTONE said, there were still fewer on the Opposition than upon the Government Benches.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that he had no wish to institute invidious comparisons, but he was bound to remind the right hon. Gentleman that there was an official duty to be present which was more binding upon the Treasury than the Opposition Benches. With regard to the merits of the question, he had nothing but a meed of praise to give to South Kensington Museum. As to the Society of Arts, of the Council of which he was Chairman, he had heard it said that they poked their nose into everybody's affairs; but they really only did so when they could promote the moral and material interests of the country at large. With regard to technical education he thought there was nothing which tended so much to its development as national museums; and upon their good government, and their being rendered accessible, depended in a great measure their success. Some weeks ago he wished to put a Question to the Government, having reference to the propriety of circulating works of art; he did not know to which Minister to address himself, as there were four or five collections belonging to the Crown under as many different authorities, and accordingly he was obliged to put his Question to the First Lord of the Treasury, fixing upon him the collective responsibility of the Government. In putting that Question he had been careful to intimate that he wished those objects of art to be circulated not only in Edinburgh and Dublin, but in Manchester and the other great hives of industry, and the right hon. Gentleman, in answer, said that the Government were anxious to do everything they could, that two collections of Turner drawings had been chosen and would be established in Dublin and in Edinburgh. Establishment, however, was different from circulation; and, in his opinion, the great want of the present day was that the superfluities of the London collections should be circulated among the populous towns in the provinces. It was therefore with great regret that he perceived a reduction in one item connected with the very principle of circulation which he desired to see carried out. A Vote, which last year stood at £4,000, was this year reduced by £500. It was certain that the Trustees of the British Museum were buying water colours of Turner's and storing them away in portfolios, while the Trustees of the National Gallery were making up parcels to be sent to Dublin and Edinburgh, and what he wanted the Vice President of the Council for Education to explain was why there had been a decrease instead of an increase, in the manner contemplated by the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright). He trusted that some explanation would be given of the reason for the reduction of this Vote, and that every facility would be afforded for the circulation throughout the provinces of specimen and duplicate works of art.

MR. BOWRING said, he did not object to the fact that this Vote exceeded by £7,000 the sum which was originally asked for; but the detail showed that whilst there was an increase of £20,000 on certain items, there was a decrease on other items of £13,000. He found that the figures of the Estimate, as they now appeared, were quite different from those originally presented. In the orignal Vote there was not a single farthing for circulating objects of Art. He noticed with regret that the sum of £500 had been struck off the Vote for scientific scholarships. With regard to the expenditure on account of the Paris Exhibition of 1867, an engagement had been taken that the whole amount should not exceed £116,650. Yet there were fresh demands coming in, and the Vote was still entirely open.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU hoped that as allusion had been made to his Draft Minute and to the evidence which he had given before the Committee of last year, upon Scientific Instruction, he might be permitted to make a few explanatory remarks upon the subject now under discussion. The learned Professor (Dr. Lyon Playfair) had alluded to a Draft Minute which had been, prepared by the late Government. This was intended partly to carry out a Minute of the 21st of December, 1867. By that Minute poor children, in the common parochial schools, were enabled to obtain scholarships that would partly support them if they went to a higher school. Under the same Minute scholars from the various parochial schools might compete for scholarships of £25 per annum on the condition that an equal sum was contributed towards their support at a higher school by the locality. A third portion of the Minute established exhibitions which would enable these poor scholars to proceed to College for three years. It was thus put in the power of poor boys in the parochial schools, who evinced peculiar talent, to rise and obtain the highest education that the country could supply. In order to carry out this system with the greatest efficiency, it was proposed to establish eight Colleges, which it was hoped would be representative Colleges, throughout the country, one at some seaport in the South of England, another in some agricultural district in the West, others in the eastern and northern counties, and some in Scotland. Thus high scientific education would be brought home to the pupils, and be given to them within easy reach of their families. He styled these Colleges representative Colleges, because the studies of each would be peculiar to itself, and bear the character of the industry in the midst of which it stood. Thus it was proposed that the scientific education to be given at the College of the seaport in the South of England should be of a maritime character, and that in the West should be of an agricultural character, and so on. The late Government having that object in view had entered into communication with the local authorities at Manchester, who had already a large sum in hand, owing to the bequest of Dr. Owen and other sources—and hopes were held out to them that the scheme he had thus indicated would be carried into effect. Unfortunately, just about that period it was surmised that the result of the elections was likely to be adverse to the then Government, and the matter was not carried further, as it was thought, by those in authority over him that it would be unfair to take the management of the plan out of the hands of their successors. He was sorry to learn from the hon. and learned Professor below the Gangway and from the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not seen his way to carry into effect a proposal which would have been beneficial to the country and would eventually have secured an actual saving in future times. He would also allude to another plan which he trusted some day to see put into operation. In the district schools at Limehouse and at Hanwell pauper children were taught as they were taught in parochial schools, with this exception—that they received two hours' instruction in the morning only, the afternoon being devoted to other pursuits, some learning drill and naval exercises, as at Limehouse, or music, drawing, shoemaking, carpentering, or other trades. He had spoken to the masters of both those schools, and they had assured him that under this system the boys learnt much faster and more thoroughly than they did when kept the whole day at their "studies." Three advantages thus accrued; the studies were fixed more firmly in the memory; the principles of a trade or profession were at the same time acquired; and the bodily exercise increased the physical health and strength. Why should not this system be extended to all parochial schools? The girls it is true spent their afternoons in learning to sew, because of the moral benefit which would accrue when they had homes of their own. Why should they not also learn cooking, and the rearing of children, and acquire habits of thrift and the principles of hygienics? And why should not the boys learn gardening or the principles of some trade? This would, to some extent, overcome the obstruction of the labour claims. Children would then remain at school to learn that which would advance them in after life. The Duke of Newcastle's Commission printed a Report, by Mr. Senior and Mr. Chadwick, strongly in favour of this method, and, therefore, he wished to direct the attention of the Government to the advantages of introducing this system into the parochial schools.

MR. POLLARD-URQUHART said, he wished to know, if the accounts for the Paris Exhibition would be soon closed, and whether the Vote of this year was in addition to that of last year?

MR. B. SAMUELSON said, he wished to know whether the Normal School at South Kensington was to be governed by a special Committee; and also whether it was to be understood that £12,000 was to be given for its support?

MR. RICHARDS said, he wished to bear testimony to the value of the Geological Museum, and of the information furnished by Dr. Percy upon minerals submitted to his examination. As a proof of the value of education in practical science, in which the Germans and other foreigners were superior to us, he might state that an hon. Member of that House had introduced a new process of smelting silver ore, and had placed at the head of his manufactory a German; also a manufacture of spelter, which was superintended by a foreigner. The same hon. Member had also a German to superintend the converting of sulphurous acid gas into sulphuric acid. The superiority of the Germans arose from the attention to such studies in their own country. He should never grudge a fair expenditure for technical education in this country.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he was very glad to find that the House of Commons took so great an interest in his Department. In reply to his hon. Friend the Member for Westmeath (Mr. Pollard-Urquhart) he had to say that the £8,647 expended by South Kensington was a re-vote of a portion of £15,000 voted for purchases of articles exhibited at the Paris Exhibition. South Kensington had taken furniture to the amount of £4,300; but this latter sum was not a new demand, but was a portion of £14,000 spent at Paris. In reply to his hon. Friend the Member for Exeter (Mr. Bowring) he must observe that in his explanation of the Estimates he had taken them as they stood. With the noble Lord opposite (Lord Henry Lennox) he regretted that only £3,500 were to be spent in circulating articles from South Kensington. His right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had felt obliged to request him to go carefully through all the Votes of his Department with the view of making them as economical as possible; but he believed that more would be done with the £3,500 than hon. Gentlemen might suppose. To the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. Samuelson) he might say that the question whether the Government would put the organization of the new school of science under a special Commissioner was one which required more consideration. All he could state was that Government was desirous of getting this school into operation as quickly as possible. It was well known that the Government had the whole system of education under consideration, and in considering it, they must, of course, direct their attention to the question of scientific and technical education. During the discussion that evening on elementary education every hon. Member must have felt that even with the utmost economy it was likely that large additional demands would have to be made on the country. That fact must make the Government very careful with regard to any pledges on the subject of scientific and technical education. There seemed to be a general feeling that if parents and neighbours did not do their duty in respect of the elementary education of children the State must step in. But when they came to scientific education it was not a question of doing a duty which ought to be discharged by others, but rather one of guiding and stimulating those who were engaged in that branch of instruction. He was in hopes that the alteration in the endowed school system would enable portions of their endowments to be applied in the cause of scientific education.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had rather misunderstood the scope of his question. He had asked whether the

Government could not do something to force the trustees of other collections, who had a plethora of articles, to circulate them through the country, as the collections at South Kensington were circulated.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £75,203, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

Mr. WALPOLE, in moving the Vote for the British Museum, said, the Estimate for 1868-9 was £99,385, whereas the Estimate for the ensuing financial year was £113,203. The increase was caused by £12,789 being required for new buildings and the repairs of the existing buildings, and by an extra sum of £1,140 being required for cataloguing. The grant of these additional sums would, he believed, be entirely approved by the House and the country. The first of these items depended upon the increased accommodation which was about to be given for the exhibition of the objects of antiquity preserved in the Museum. The Committee must be well aware that for a long time some antiquarian objects had been kept under sheds, and it had now been deemed desirable that they should be exhibited to the public. The plan which the trustees had resolved to adopt was that which was recommended in 1861, and which had received the sanction of the Government—namely, the extension of the room where the Elgin marbles were now exhibited, so as to enable the trustees to exhibit, in a consecutive series of chambers, the various articles which were not at present exhibited at all. An expenditure of £12,000 odd had been sanctioned by the Treasury for this purpose. The buildings would be extended in a direction which would enable the trustees to exhibit the articles now out of sight of the public, and also to carry out ultimately the scheme which had been approved by the House of separating the Natural History Collection from the Collection of Antiquities with a view to give increased accommodation to the latter. The other item of increase was £1,140 in respect of additional catalogues. He need hardly expatiate on the enormous utility of accurate and exhaustive catalogues. Those relating to Hebrew literature were now, he was glad to say, completed. The catalogue of Spanish literature was in progress. But it was of still greater importance that a classified catalogue of all the MSS. in the Museum should be taken in hand without delay, and rendered as complete as possible. For this reason he had great confidence that the Committee would sanction the proposed increase of expenditure. Following the course he had adopted in previous years, he would now refer to some matters which had occurred during the last twelve months, and which, in his opinion, were deserving of attention. It would be satisfactory to the Committee to know that there had been a progressive increase since 1864 in the number of persons who had visited the Museum to inspect the general collection or gone there for purposes of study. In 1865 the number of persons admitted to see the general collections was 365,900; and, in 1868, it had increased to 461,000. In 1865 there were 477,000 persons who visited the Museum for purposes of study as compared with 575,000 in 1868. Representations had been made to the trustees by Members of that House and others respecting the difficulty experienced by readers in obtaining books, more especially on Saturdays. There was, in fact, enormous difficulty sometimes felt in attending to the requirements of the enormous number of persons who frequented the reading-room. On ordinary occasions the attendants were able to give out the books as they were demanded, and, as a rule, within the space of ten minutes; but on some occasions, especially on Saturdays, between twelve and two o'clock, so many persons applied for books that great delay occurred in supplying them. On such occasions twenty minutes or half-an-hour elapsed before books were delivered. The trustees had carefully considered the whole subject, and on their behalf he wished to remark that the frequenters of the reading-room ought to attend more strictly to the printed rules in order to prevent delay. Some of the written applications for books were so defective or illegible that it was impossible for the attendants to find the volumes required. In order to meet the pressure on extraordinary occasions the trustees had increased the number of attendants, and he trusted that, in future, the books would be delivered to students within ten minutes or a quarter-of-an-hour of their being applied for. The average number of readers daily last year was 350, and the average number of books consulted by each was twelve a day. The Japanese Collection had been brought to a state of great perfection during the past year; indeed, the collection of books printed and manuscript relating to the literature, history, politics, poetry, law, and philosophy of Japan could hardly be equalled in any other European country. Then, 350 volumes representing Abyssinian literature from the 15th century to the present time had, thanks to the India Office, acceding to a request made by the trustees, been added to the treasures of the Museum. He would only add that the accounts of the British Museum, of which the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) had complained that the audit was not so complete as it ought to be, were now periodically submitted to the Audit Office, and were specifically audited from month to month, and the House had full opportunities of considering the manner in which that audit was carried out.

Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £10,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, including the purchase of Pictures."

MR. BENTINCK said, that the system of purchasing pictures for this institution had not been carried on in accordance with the true principles of economy. There were very few people in this country who objected to paying a good price for a good article; but he had constantly noticed, year after year, that works of art had been offered to the National Gallery for sale, or that the National Gallery had had opportunities of buying them at public sales, and that they were refused, either by the Director or the responsible body, when so privately or publicly offered to them—but that afterwards the very same pictures were bought for the nation at greatly enhanced prices. A wasteful expenditure of public money was the consequence of that irresolution and vacillation. In 1867, two pictures, attributed to an artist of the 15th century, were brought to England and offered to the Director of the National Gallery, who would then have nothing to do with them. Afterwards, another Director of that Institution went to Florence, where he saw those two pictures, and paid the large price of £600 for them. Again, in June, 1867, a picture by a Dutch artist—Van Huysum—was sold at Christie's auction-room, and fetched 380 guineas. In April of last year another picture by Cuyp was also put up to auction at the same place, and knocked down to the same dealer for 384 guineas. Now those two pictures had lately been acquired for the National Gallery for the sum of £1,800. Why did not the authorities of the National Gallery, if they wanted those pictures, go to the auction-room and buy them? Many instances of the same kind had happened at South Kensington. He was not entering into the question of taste, but into that of economy. He was ready to admit that the last-named pictures were valuable, and such as ought to be seen where they now were; but he could not understand why those who bought for the nation could not buy upon the same rules, and as advantageously, as private purchasers. Moreover, there was a conflict between four or five different departments, all of which had the power of buying pictures. Among them were the South Kensington Museum and the National Portrait Gallery. Last Saturday week, some very remarkable works, by Hogarth, were sold at a public auction-room in London, and he was rather surprised that none of them found their way to the national collection. He was told that the National Gallery desired to buy certain of the pictures offered at that sale, but the Portrait Gallery said they were in their department, and they should buy them. Then, when a picture of great interest was bid for, the price became high, and ultimately the Portrait Gallery did not buy—the reason given being, that they had not enough money. Surely there ought to be a proper understanding between the different departments by which, instead of competing with each other valuable pictures might be secured for the nation on reasonable and advantageous terms. He had seen the spectacle of the different departments that had the charge of art, bidding against each other. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: We have put an end to that.] Then let them put an end to it in the case of pictures also. Every year the Director of the National Gallery went abroad to buy pictures, and there adopted the same fatal principle as was adopted in England. The late Director used to make a sort of progress through Italy—he presumed the present Director did the same — and he dealt with the Italians as the agent of the English Government. However clever an Englishman who had pictures to sell was, an Italian dealer was three times cleverer, and should be met with his own weapons. He knew several pictures bought in the North of Italy, which, if negotiated for by private persons, might have been purchased considerably cheaper. Foreign vendors think that England is a nation of gold—that the English Treasury is inexhaustible—and they would never come down in their terms when they knew they were dealing with the Director of the National Gallery. There was another point to which he wished to call attention; and that was, as to the lamentable effects, of late years, of scraping or "restoring," as it is called, the pictures of the National Gallery. On the 9th of August, 1867, his noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) called attention to this subject, and his hon. and learned Friend the present Solicitor General was brought specially from circuit, and had a brief handed to him by the representatives of the National Gallery. His hon. and learned Friend, in a speech of course able, and, to himself, no doubt convincing, said he was quite sure that no artist or person conversant with art could deny that the restoration of the pictures referred to was satisfactory. But his hon. and learned Friend would probably now be convinced that part of his statement was made under a delusion, for he would hardly find any gentleman really conversant with art, and who preferred that pictures should not be "made beautiful for ever," who would agree with the opinion which his hon. and learned Friend then expressed. As to one of those pictures, the celebrated landscape of Rubens, which had been presented by Sir George Beaumont, it was really impossible for anyone who knew the top of a picture from the bottom not to be satisfied that it had been totally and completely destroyed. Then there were the two beautiful Caraccis and the beautiful Tintoretto, all of which exhibited the same signs of ill-usage. Now, some fifteen years ago exception was taken to the manner in which the pictures were being cleaned, and a Committee was appointed which did not arrive at any positive result, for all manner of clever people were employed to show how mistaken those were who supposed the pictures were destroyed, and they said that just a few years of London smoke and dirt would restore them to the state they were in before. But there the pictures were, and nobody could doubt that the Claude and other pictures had been materially injured. And so it was with the Rubens. And what was the cause? It was that the Trustees of the National Gallery had employed an Italian picture-cleaner. But all acquainted with Italian picture-cleaners must know what ravages they had committed in Italy, and it was no surprise, if they were introduced in England, that the same result should follow. He wanted to know why were not English picture-cleaners employed, for they were superior to any in the world. They had heard to-night a good deal about protection; but if in France or Italy an Englishman were put at the head for the purpose of restoring pictures the Government would be at once condemned. When they found that noblemen and gentlemen who possessed valuable pictures could get them cleaned without having them injured, why should not the Trustees of the National Gallery get the same thing done? He should also desire to know from Her Majesty's Government where the art library collected by Sir Charles Eastlake, for the purchase of which he found £2,008 charged, was to be located, whether in the National Gallery or where else? We had other art libraries. There was one in the British Museum and one at South Kensington; but he should like to know whether that of Sir Charles Eastlake was to be left at the National Gallery? That would not be a following out of the principles of economy.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he could not help saying one word about the Rubens. His hon. Friend (Mr. Bentinck) had remarked that no one who knew the top of a picture from the bottom could fail to admit that this picture had been entirely destroyed. Now he, on the contrary, must say that it had been greatly improved, and that all his hon. Friend had proved was that he did not know the top from the bottom. He had looked at the picture very carefully, and he believed there was not an artist in England but would say that it had been greatly improved. But there was a certain school, of which Sir George Beaumont had been the head, and of which he supposed his hon. Friend was an apostle, who could admire no pictures that were out of a certain brown colour. Now, if Sir George Beaumont was the head of that brown and liquorice water school he ventured to say that it had also got a tail. But there were many colours besides brown, and Rubens was well acquainted with them, and in painting his pictures he exhausted all the resources of the palette. That picture of Rubens was so covered over that one could not see the Antwerp Cathedral; but now that this conventional brown was removed there was to be seen a landscape of every variety of hue, and equal in brilliancy to one of Turner's. The same observations would apply to almost all the other pictures which the hon. Members had mentioned.

Mr. LAYARD said, he wished to say a word in reply to the attack that had been made upon Mr. Boxall. [Mr. Bentinck: I made no attack on him.] The hon. and learned Gentleman had done so by implication. The manner in which the landscape by Rubens had been cleaned had been vindicated by his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Robert Collier), himself an accomplished artist. The pictures to which the hon. Member (Mr. Bentinck) referred were never, he believed, in England before they were bought. With regard to the employment of picture-cleaners, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that the Director of the National Gallery did employ English picture-cleaners frequently. He wished his hon. Friend would not make such statements without previous inquiry, as they were painful to gentlemen of the highest character. The best proof of the way in which Mr. Boxall had managed the National Gallery was the high estimation in which it was held throughout the world. He had no hesitation in saying that for its size it was one of the finest galleries in Europe; there was not a picture in it which he could wish to see removed.

Mr. FLOYER said, he was somewhat alarmed at the enthusiastic manner in which the Attorney General had spoken of the cleaning of the pictures in the National Gallery. Any one fond of pictures who had travelled abroad, and had seen the galleries, especially that in Madrid, would allow how dangerous it was to carry cleaning too far. Though loth to give a very decided opinion on the cleaning of the Rubens, he submitted with confidence that the cleaning had been carried to the utmost limit consistent with prudence. Admitting the advantage of getting rid of the liquorice colour, he thought the picture at present looked rather raw, and was afraid it had been cut down from the surface colours to something like the foundation of the painting. The Chief Commissioner should remember in giving the praise due to Mr. Boxall that the present position of the National Gallery was to a large extent owing to the discriminating genius of the late Sir Charles Eastlake.

Mr. BENTINCK said, he had not wished to detract from Mr. Boxall's ability; his criticism was all directed against purchasing pictures for the national collection at a high price. The Attorney General had placed himself in competition with Sir George Beaumont as a judge of Art; and of the two he preferred Sir George Beaumont very much indeed.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

DUBLIN FREEMEN COMMISSION BILL.

[Bill 189.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue.*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. COLLINS rose to move an Instruction to the Committee to include in the Bill a Commission to inquire into corrupt practices at Youghal during the last Election. He had always held the doctrine that cases might arise in which exceptional proceedings would be desirable, and without expressing an opinion on the case of Dublin, he submitted that if ever there was a case in which special measures were necessary it was the case of Youghal. The objection to raising such questions as that before the House was that they gave rise to interminable disputes, and that the Motion might be regarded as in some sort a reflection upon the Judge. Having looked through the evidence taken in other cases—including Stafford, Brecon, and Bewdley—he came to the conclusion that Youghal was exceptional altogether. He would be the last man to say that a Judge had not made a correct Report upon the evidence, but there might be corrupt practices of such a character that, while they involved the demoralization of a borough, they were not corrupt within the meaning of the statute, and it was still desirable that the House should have them investigated. The population of the town of Youghal was 6,700; there were 280 electors; and of these Mr. Weguelin, who was unseated, polled 127. Mr. Butt, Q.C., who was formerly Member for the borough, said the sum expended at the last election by Mr. Weguelin would be about £4,000, and probably £5,000 in all; Mr. Justice O'Brien said it would be even more than that; and it was but a rule-of-three sum to calculate that the 127 electors cost £39 7*s.* 4¾*d.* per head, or practically £40 each. Mr. Baron Martin tried the Westminster and Bradford petitions, and concluded that the expenditure of £9,000 in each case was of itself *primâ facie* evidence of the election having been carried by improper means; but at the ratio of expenditure which prevailed at Youghal, the Westminster Election would have cost the candidate petitioned against rather more than £250,000, and the Bradford Election £128,000. If £9,000 was a large sum for Westminster or Bradford, there was a fair case for inquiry with reference to Youghal. The circumstances were exceptional, and, therefore, the case ought to be dealt with in an exceptional manner. He had no sympathy with wealthy men coming to the House by means of lavish expenditure in boroughs. It was not to the advantage of the House that small boroughs should be deemed places for which anybody could be elected who would go down and spend £5,000 or £6,000, either in direct bribery or profligate expenditure. In this case the money was not spent by a gentleman resident in the place, and having any special love for it, but by a London bank director. He heard of the place, he said, in July; he did not know of its existence before, and he gave Mr. Mooney £500 for the introduction to it. A local gentleman might have a kindly feeling for a place, but the same could not be said for a perfect stranger. By the 12th of August Mr. Weguelin had spent £1,500, and the election was not held until November. Mr. Weguelin said his father had been Member for Southampton, which cost £2,300, and, therefore, he thought Youghal would cost £1,000; but by August he had spent £1,500, and by the election £5,000. Were they to be told that this was not to be inquired into because the money was not given in hard cash to the electors? It was spent in every other conceivable form of demoralization. He had asked for the evidence taken at the inquiry on the petition, but was told that it was unnecessary to print it, because it was well known what the evidence was. The bounteous heart of the candidate took pity on the little shoeless urchins found in the street and shod them at a cost of £34 10*s.*; stockings were also purchased for them; and £15 worth of lace was bought from Mrs. M'Gowan, who was an owner of property in the town and had influence. The candidate's explanation was, that he wanted to have the ladies on his side. Money was given away in the streets to all who wanted it, whether they were electors or not, and Mr. Weguelin objected to spending money in that useless way. He estimated that the money given away went at the rate of £20 a week. Was not this a case for special legislation? There had been special legislation in the cases of St. Albans and Sudbury; and, in the former, Mr. Bell, whose object in desiring to get into Parliament was to improve the position of the pharmaceutical chemists, thought it necessary to spend £5,000, which was called "Bell metal." This form of corruption was more demoralizing than direct bribery, because it was more difficult to get at. He limited his inquiry to the election in November, and an inquiry now could not affect anybody's seat, or the balance of parties. He wished to follow the analogy of the case of St. Albans, in which Mr. Bell was declared duly elected according to the evidence; the House was not satisfied, and decreed a Commission, and the result was St. Albans was disfranchised. There was no doubt that this was exceptional legislation; but he did not think there was any case that ran on all fours with this one; for in this instance upwards of £5,000 had been spent in a borough with a population of 6,000 inhabitants, in inducing 127 men to vote for Mr. Weguelin. Although this London banker deliberately went down to corrupt this borough, Youghal was worse than this young man, because there was no doubt that the borough was corrupt before he went there. Mr. Mooney, however, evidently wanted some one who understood the character of the place, and he succeeded in finding a man after his own heart. He was quite aware that the Judge had reported that corrupt practices had not prevailed at Youghal. But what he wanted was to get a notion as to how this £5,000 had been expended. There had evidently been a stream of Pactolus borne into Youghal, for it must be remembered that if £5,000 were expended on one side, the expenditure on the other probably amounted to £3,000 or £4,000. Such a great scandal as this ought not to go uninquired into, and if inquiry were not made into this case it would be idle to inquire into others. At any rate, considering the nature of the transactions that had occurred, he felt sure that the House would acknowledge he had done nothing but his duty in bringing it forward. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Instruction of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to include in the Bill a Commission to inquire into corrupt practices at the Election for Youghal held in November last,"—(*Mr. Collins,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he had no wish to enter into the merits of the case brought forward by his hon. Friend (Mr. Collins), but he would appeal to him in common fairness not to press his Amendment at the present moment. In an analogous matter—that of a case *sub judice*—it was the practice of the Press of this country to forbear comment, and he would remind his hon. Friend that the petition against the sitting Member for Youghal would be coming on for trial shortly. Was it fair, in the meanwhile, to enter into a discussion which must have some effect upon that petition? As far as he understood the matter, a portion of the charge against his hon. Friend the sitting Member for Youghal was that Mr. Weguelin rendered him assistance at his election, and the question would arise whether Mr. Weguelin acted as his agent, and whether his conduct had vitiated his hon. Friend's election. Was it fair to anticipate and prejudice that inquiry by a discussion and another inquiry at the present moment? His hon. Friend desired that an inquiry should be held with a view to getting information for future legislation. One inquiry, however, had already been held, and another would shortly be held before one of the Superior Judges. That ought to satisfy his hon. Friend, who, he felt sure, was too fair and too manly to desire to prejudice the case about to be tried.

MR. COLLINS said, he was quite ready to agree to the placing a clause in the Bill which should postpone the inquiry for which he asked until the petition against the sitting Member had been disposed of.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 184; Noes 78: Majority 106.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. J. LOWTHER took occasion to say that he had, on a former occasion, stated with some confidence that neither the long Parliamentary experience, nor the knowledge of history which any hon. Member might possess, could enable him to furnish a precedent for the institution of such an inquiry as the Government proposed to adopt in the present instance. Subsequent investigation emboldened him to go further, and to maintain that such a proposition had never before been submitted to the notice of the House of Commons. When he had spoken of the course which the Government asked the House to adopt as being unprecedented, no one on the

Liberal side of the House had risen to contradict, and no attempt was made to distort the cases of Yarmouth or St. Albans into a basis for such exceptional legislation. The hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Mr. James), indeed, dealt with the question as if it were necessary to create a precedent, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland contended that the Government did not direct their measure against the freemen of Dublin as freemen, but that they would be prepared to deal in the same way, if necessary, with lodgers or any other class of voters. Now, he ventured to think that the Government scarcely appreciated the entirely novel nature of the proceedings which they invited the House to sanction, and he, for one, altogether objected to the institution of so exceptional an inquiry. It was only owing to the high character of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Morpeth (Sir George Grey) that the Bill which he had introduced on the subject was not characterized as something very nearly approximating to a party job, and it was simply because of the high responsibility which attached to Ministers of the Crown that the measure before the House was not spoken of in similar terms. He should like to hear what the Government had further to say in the matter by way of explanation, and he should therefore move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. SULLIVAN) said, this subject had been often argued, and it was thoroughly exhausted. If there had been no precedent for such a measure the Report of the learned Judge was of such a character that both the Government and the House would be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty if they did not take action in the matter. But there was a precedent in the case of Yarmouth, where, upon the Report of a Committee of the House, a Bill was introduced to disfranchise the freemen, while the Government now merely proposed inquiry, not disfranchisement.

SIR JOHN HAY said, the earnest desire of the Government to suppress corruption had been shown by their votes on the question of Youghal, which happened to return a Whig, while Dublin had returned a Conservative.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that he had never heard in that House a more unfounded and unwarrantable statement than that of the hon. and gallant Member (Sir John Hay). The decisions of the House were guided not by the politics of Members returned for particular boroughs, but by the Reports of the Election Judges. In the case of Youghal the learned Judge reported that corruption did not extensively prevail, and the House would not have been justified in taking any action. But in the case of Dublin the Report of the Judge was of precisely an opposite character, and it would be disgraceful on the part of the House to take no notice of the words used in that Report.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, it was clear that one man might steal a horse while another must not look over the hedge. If the price of votes at Dublin had been £5, at Youghal it had been £40. He had stood five rattling contests, and they had not cost him as much as the expenses at the little miserable borough of Youghal; yet, because that borough returned a Liberal, there was to be no inquiry.

MR. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN reminded hon. Members opposite of the course they had taken with regard to the Bewdley Election. This should be borne in mind when Members on the Ministerial side of the House were taunted with favouring corruption.

MR. COLLINS said, there was no analogy between the case of Bewdley and that of Youghal. The expenditure in the first case was about £3 per head, in the other about £40.

MR. SHERLOCK, referring to the Youghal case, quoted from the Report of the learned Judge, who said that seventy-eight cases of bribery had been charged, and not one of them had been substantiated. The learned Judge, therefore, declined to report that corruption extensively prevailed at Youghal; and the House, therefore, had no ground for instituting an inquiry there.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair." —(*Mr. James Lowther*.)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 75; Noes 189: Majority 114.

MR. BAGWELL proposed to insert words in the Preamble, so that the inquiry might not be confined to the conduct of the bribed alone, but should include also the conduct of the bribers.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. SULLIVAN) said, he would point out that such extended inquiry was incident to the duty which the Commissioners would have to discharge.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he thought that there could be no difference of opinion as to the propriety of including within the scope of the inquiry the conduct of those who administered bribes, but as the words of the hon. Member's Amendment did not appear to be most happily chosen, the proposal had better be deferred until the Report of the Bill.

SIR GEORGE GREY observed that the Preamble was merely a recital of the Judge's Report.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, as the Government appeared to be great purists, he wished to know if they would prosecute one who had been guilty of personal bribery; for, if so, he would find his name for them? He would ask that question of the Government on Monday next.

Amendment *negatived.*

Preamble *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

TRADES UNIONS (PROTECTION OF FUNDS) BILL—[BILL 216.]

(*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BONHAM-CARTER said, that the measure proposed to extend to these societies a remedy which was not participated in by any other subjects of Her Majesty, except members of friendly societies; and, in his opinion, it was doubtful whether this was the proper way of correcting the defects of the present law.

MR. COLLINS said, that he felt obliged to the Government for having brought in the measure this Session.

MR. WHALLEY said, he was glad that the operation of the Bill had been confined to one year.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 215.] [*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE complained that the Bill had been reprinted without any of the Amendments made by the other House, and just as it was introduced into the House. He thought that those Amendments ought, at least, to be printed or indicated by some different type.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the Bill had been committed *pro formâ,* in order to its being printed, and that the usual course had been followed. He proposed to proceed with the Bill at a Morning Sitting on Tuesday, the 27th inst.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he had yet to learn that the usual course had been followed in reprinting a Bill that had come down from the Lords without any of the Amendments made by that House.

Committee *deferred* till *Tuesday* next, at Two of the clock.

FORTIFICATIONS [PROVISION FOR EXPENSES] BILL.

Resolutions *reported,* and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. Secretary CARDWELL, and Captain VIVIAN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 223.]

BASSES LIGHTS (CEYLON) BILL.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to make provision for the erection of a Lighthouse on the Great Basses Rock, in the Colony of Ceylon, and to enable the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury and the Secretary of State in Council of India to guarantee the Principal and Interest of any Advances which may be made by the Public Works Loans Commissioners for that purpose."

Resolution *agreed to*: — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. AYRTON, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. GRANT DUFF.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 224.]

TELEGRAPH BILL.

Select Committee on Telegraph Bill to consist of The Marquess of HARTINGTON, Mr. HUNT, and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum:—Leave to the Committee to sit and proceed upon *Thursday.*

MILITIA PAY BILL.

Bill to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in Great Britain and Ireland; to grant Allowances in certain cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia; and to authorize the employment of the Non-commissioned Officers, *presented*, and read the first time.

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 20*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Jamaica Loans* (204); Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* (205); Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* (206).

Second Reading—Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland)* (175); Seamen's Clothing* (189); Fines and Fees Collection* (155); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (183); Queen Anne's Bounty (Superannuation Allowances)* (185).

Committee — Report — Charity Commissioners* (170); Special Bails* (166); Assessed Rates* (174); Sunday and Ragged Schools* (188).

Third Reading—Bishops Resignation* (201); Greenwich Hospital* (202); Stipendiary Magistrates (Deputies)* (179); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act (1860) Amendment* (159); Court of Session Act (1868) Amendment* (164); Local Government Supplemental* (140), and *passed.*

IRISH CHURCH BILL—(No. 196.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED.

Commons amendments to Lords amendments and Commons reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to order).

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, it is now, I believe, about five weeks ago that I most imperfectly endeavoured to state to your Lordships the reason why, in my opinion, it was desirable that you should adhere to the principles and main provisions of this Bill. A very short time before I moved the second reading it certainly was not the general opinon that any organized party attempt was to be made to reject the Bill at that stage. The attempt, however, was made; and I believe the decision at which the majority of the House arrived was received by the public with as little blame and as much praise as any decision on so momentous a question could possibly have been received. I need hardly allude to the character of the discussions which have taken place in this House on this Bill. I believe that the high intellectual standard that has been maintained in your Lordships' discussions has been justly appreciated by the country, and has given to this House whatever power and reputation the exhibition of ability, of knowledge, and of eloquence can give to any assembly. There are specks even upon the sun; and it certainly must have been remarked that during the earlier part of that discussion hard words were used, not only with regard to the measure itself, but with regard to persons who were connected with it; but I believe it was gratifying to your Lordships that that discussion — something like the process of generous wine undergoing fermentation—purified itself, and that, with very few exceptions, towards the end, the debate towards its close carried on in that calm and argumentative style which, after all, is the best adapted to the grave consideration of important subjects by your Lordships. I hope the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) will permit me to say that, while I entirely differ from his point of view with regard to this question, I think that, starting with his views, his fair manner of conducting the proceedings of this House, and the moderation of his language, contributed greatly to a result which, on reflection, I am sure your Lordships must approve. On going into Committee the course was not taken here which had been pursued in "another place," where the Leader of the Opposition, although at the head of a minority only, himself proposed a consecutive series of Amendments. I have not the slightest reason to complain of the noble and learned Lord opposite; but whether from the fault of circumstances or for any other reason, he confined himself, with the exception of one material Amendment—which I think was an afterthought, no notice being given of it till after we went into Committee—to Amendments of an inconsiderable and possibly of a more general character. Amendments were, however, proposed from every side of the House, representing the views of almost every shade and section of opinion in your

Lordships' House; and the result was that a very large mass of Amendments were adopted and sent down to "another place." Some of these, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, were important, some of them unimportant, some good, some bad, and some indifferent. There were two, at least, which even, if the substance of them could have been agreeable to the House of Commons, were so imperfectly worded that it would have been impossible to agree to them in their existing terms. Now, I have seen it stated that, at the instigation of Her Majesty's Government all your Lordships' Amendments were contumeliously rejected in "another place." May I be allowed to say a few words with regard to the tone of the two nights' debates in which your Lordships' Amendments were considered? It is quite true that the Prime Minister, using something of an aeronautical metaphor, suggested that we, in this Chamber, were somewhat elevated above the earth, and that we had not those special opportunities of knowing the feelings and wishes of the great constituencies of the United Kingdom as those had who last autumn were engaged in election contests, and who have since that time been in continual communication with those constituencies. I will also say—that the Leader of the Conservative party was so carried away by the heat of debate as to insinuate that on one most important question of the Bill your Lordships did not quite know your own minds. I think however it is a remarkable thing, and one which must be satisfactory to your Lordships, that when this Bill went back to the House of Commons, where an enormous majority had shown their approval and approbation of it—when it went down, according to the description of a representative of the Irish Church in that place, as entirely a different scheme—not one word, excepting the very mild expressions to which I have alluded, and which perhaps your Lordships will admit have some little truth in them—not one word that was uncourteous or disrespectful was uttered in that place with regard to any of your Lordships individually or collectively. As to the alleged supercilious rejection of your Lordships' Amendments, you will remember that I stated, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government that they would be ready to welcome any Amendments which appeared to them to be improvements in the Bill, and that even if alterations were suggested which did not appear to them to be improvements, they would give them a respectful consideration. I am not quite sure of the words I used, but that was the substance of them. Now, I am aware that with regard to the mere letter of such a declaration, it would be easy to justify almost any course that might have been taken by Her Majesty's Government, but I have no hesitation in saying—what I think is due to myself and due to your Lordships—that if it were true that the Amendments introduced by your Lordships had been all contumeliously rejected by the other House of Parliament, at the instigation of the Government, I should deem myself to have been repudiated by my Colleagues in that place, or to have been guilty of something like a breach of faith in dealing with your Lordships in this House. What, however, is the fact? Your Lordships sent down sixty-two Amendments—not counting those which are simply a repetition of exactly the same thing. Of these thirty-five were adopted in "another place," fourteen were re-amended, and thirteen were rejected. Now, it may be said in answer to this that the Government and the House of Commons merely adopted the absolutely unimportant Amendments, while we rejected *en masse* those which were really important or advantageous to the Irish Church. That, however, I entirely deny; and I will bring it to a somewhat vulgar but practical test. I do so more readily because the most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury), making a sort of apology which was quite unnecessary for one who personally and officially occupies so high a rank in the Church, said he had been actuated by higher motives than mere money, but that money was a necessity in his view with regard to the future of the Irish Church. Now with reference to this question of money, I cannot help pointing out to your Lordships that the Government and the friends of the Irish Church as represented in this House do not stand exactly on a like basis of negotiation. On the second reading a distinction was made, which I could never quite understand, and which was certainly repudiated by myself and my Colleagues, it being argued that though the principle of the Bill was the disestablishment of the Irish Church, there was no principle of disendowment involved in it. Her Majesty's Government, on the contrary, supported in this, as your Lordships know, by the great majority of the House of Commons, hold that both disestablishment and disendowment form the principle of the Bill. This shows that in coming to anything like an understanding between the two Houses the friends of the Irish Church could not say—"This is a mere question of degree; you have already given £10,000,000 for the maintenance of the Church; we do not think it enough; the most rev. Primate says we should have £3,000,000 more to float it, and we require £4,000,000 more for that purpose." All we could do was to act on the principle which he had maintained, and to see whether, in dealing with the vested interests of the clergy, or with those large means which very probably, but indirectly, will add to the revenue of the future Church, we could not go further than we had already gone. Well, what has been the result? We have added to the Bill, partly by the adoption of your Lordships' Amendments, partly by re-amendments to some of them, a sum which we estimate at £410,000, by a proposition to give 7 per cent in addition to the commutation of clergymen's lives. We have added, with regard to curates, an amount which I am not prepared to state precisely, but which is something between £50,000 and £150,000, and is certainly as much as the smaller sum. Then, with regard to private benefactions, Mr. Gladstone, in his speech on the 3rd of March, said that, in his opinion, the property from this source was worth £500,000. It was liable, however, to life interests, and if you deduct these life interests from that sum, the Amendment giving the Church £500,000 for these benefactions, amounts to an addition of £270,000 to the sum available to the Church which was originally proposed in the Bill. Taking the most rev. Primate's calculation, the value of the property is larger, while, according to the calculation of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), it amounts to £8,000 a year, which, at fifteen years' purchase, would be equal to a lump sum of £120,000. While adhering, therefore, to the principles we profess, we have added £840,000 to the amount originally given to the Church by the Bill. It is impossible, then, for your Lordships to say that your Amendments were contumeliously put aside, and that the Bill has been returned to you in the very shape in which it was originally presented. I thought it necessary to state this fact, since it affects not only the respect due to your Lordships but my own private honour.

I have now to deal with the numerous Amendments in order; and I have in the first place to ask your Lordships to assent to the re-insertion in the first paragraph of the Preamble of the words—

> "Held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

Now the omission of those words was supported by noble Lords holding different opinions. It was supported by those who are anxious for the clause which was moved by the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope), giving concurrent endowment to the three great denominations in Ireland. It was also supported by many of your Lordships who are entirely opposed to anything like "levelling up," or concurrent endowment, but who disapprove the disposition of the surplus recommended by the Government, and wished for a postponement of the question. Now, it is impossible to separate these words and the omission of them from the larger question of concurrent endowment which has been argued with such great ability by Peers on both sides of the House. That proposal was objected to by some on abstract grounds, while many, though not all of us, said that if it was a perfectly open question and not at all connected with other circumstances, it would have appeared to us a plan not disadvantageous to the State. But our great objection was, that from the course of events and from the feeling that existed in England, in Ireland, and in Scotland, it was perfectly impossible to give effect to any such scheme. Now, we have derived some little information since that proposal was first rejected and subsequently accepted by your Lordships' House. I will not refer to the utter absence of anything like public demonstrations in favour of concurrent endowment, nor do I wish to refer to any of the great meetings which have been held in different places, directed very much against that particular scheme; I will not refer to the almost innumerable memorials which, from all parts of the kingdom, have been forwarded to Members of Her Majesty's Government—but I will merely state what has passed in "another place." Your Lordships know that the Government—rightly or wrongly, as your Lordships may please to think — stated that they believed it would be a breach of faith towards the constituencies of the country, and entirely inconsistent with all they had said or done, if they could favour the proposal at the time at which we have now arrived. I ask your Lordships also to consider what was the language of Mr. Gathorne Hardy and of Mr. Disraeli. I ask you also to consider the fact that notwithstanding the able advocacy of men of such high reputation, great ability, and consequent influence in the House of Commons as Sir Roundell Palmer and Sir George Grey, it was not even ventured to take a division upon the question in its direct form; and that even in the less direct form of leaving the door open for the future consideration of the subject fifty-one Irish Members out of ninety-one voted against even such an indirect proposal. I venture to appeal to noble Lords opposite, as practical statesmen, whether it was possible, then, that we should regard concurrent endowment as a feasible proposition. I will almost venture to appeal to my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey). It is rather sanguine, I know, to expect any admission from him on a subject in which he takes great interest; but I venture to make the appeal, because it would be so singularly agreeable to me if he did make that admission, since I should then have a right to claim from him the fulfilment of something like a promise he made last year —that, if his own plan of endowing the different sects in Ireland was found to be impracticable, he should feel bound, though with regret, to vote for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church rather than allow it to remain in its present condition.

And now a very few words as to the proposal of suspending the question of the application of the surplus. The more I have thought on the proposal and the more I have seen it discussed the more convinced have I become that it is a proposition as unstatesmanlike and as little Conservative — using the word Conservative in the best sense — as it is possible to imagine. I cannot conceive that your Lordships should be blind to the great disadvantage of keeping this question open; for even if you disagree with the measure you must wish to give it a fair chance if it is to pass at all. Your Lordships must see that you would multiply irritating discussions, which could lead to no good, but to the greatest possible harm. As I ventured to point out the other day, it will take away all stimulus from the Irish Church to exert itself if some millions are kept dangling before its eyes; and, on the other hand, it will be a great discouragement to it when trying to obtain contributions from the laity. It will act exactly in the same way with regard to the requirements of the Roman Catholics. It is now a great advantage that, while this Bill generally is entirely approved by our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in Ireland, they perfectly and cheerfully acquiesce in the arrangement as to the disposal of the fund which we propose. But will that last? Is it not likely that they will begin to clamour for the application of these millions of money in whatever way a majority of Irishmen some years hence choose to ask for? And, on the other hand, will it not be the greatest discouragement, when we wish to pass a measure which is to produce harmony among different religious sects, that you should have enormous bodies of people in this country, in the North of Ireland, and in Scotland, urged not only by religious principles but also by the strongest possible political principles to excite something like a "No-Popery" feeling against those Roman Catholics who probably may then have changed their opinions and may desire to obtain these endowments? Your Lordships have produced no alternative whatever except that of concurrent endowment, which I feel convinced you will not pretend to say is in accordance with the national will. It is true my noble Friend (Earl Russell) has given notice of a proposition for applying the surplus to educational purposes; but I am sure he cannot seriously expect that the House should agree at this stage of the Bill to so vague a declaration of that nature. In "another place" some of the Liberal party voted in favour of postponement, but for different reasons —some for the promotion of secular education in Ireland, others on account of a distant view of the probability of settling the land question upon such a basis; but as to any really practical alternative which has been offered to Parliament or the country with regard to the disposal of the surplus, I may assert most positively that the one sole alternative is that of the concurrent endowment of the three great denominations. For these reasons I ask your Lordships to assent to the restoration of the words—

> "Held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

It was *moved*,

> That this House do not insist on so much of the Amendment made in the Preamble, to which the Commons have disagreed, as consists in leaving out the words ("held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion.")—(*The Earl Granville.*)

LORD CAIRNS: It was not surprising, and I think it was not inconvenient, that the noble Earl in proposing the first Resolution of those which stand in his name, should have gone somewhat beyond the details of the particular Motion, and should have asked your Lordships to consider the general position of this measure. It may save time hereafter if, in a moderate degree, I follow the example of the noble Earl; and, following that example, I will reserve for the present what I have to say upon the precise Motion he has submitted with regard to the Preamble. Something fell from the noble Earl which made the nature of the Motion somewhat doubtful, but the ordinary and I suppose the only regular Motion is that the House should not insist on its Amendment of the Preamble.

EARL GRANVILLE: Perhaps I may be allowed to explain. If my Motion is agreed to, I shall propose, on Clause 68, not only to adopt the provision as to laying before Parliament any proposed application of the funds, but to re-amend that Amendment, with a view of making the provision more clear and unmistakable. At present my Motion is to restore in the Preamble the words—

> "Held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

LORD CAIRNS: The noble Earl, in fact, asks your Lordships not to insist on your Amendment to the Preamble. If the noble Earl intends to ask us to insist on one part of our Amendment, and not on the other, I apprehend it is not in his power to do so; but if he wishes that we should not insist on the Amendment as a whole, that is the only form of Motion which I apprehend can be put. I will refer presently to the precise merits of that Motion; but, in the first place, your Lordships will allow me to consider the actual history and position of the measure. The noble Earl reminded your Lordships that it is only a few weeks since he asked your Lordships in a very imperfect way—depreciating, I think, greatly too much his own powers —to assent to the second reading of the Bill. Now, the question which your Lordships had then to consider was one of the most serious ever presented to this House. I believe I am right in saying that the merits of this Bill were such as did not commend themselves to the great majority of your Lordships. Many of your Lordships—I myself being among the number—felt that we were bound in our consciences to vote against the second reading. There were others of your Lordships who, I believe, thought not more favourably of the Bill than we did, but who thought, notwithstanding, that it was their duty—having regard to what was called the verdict of the country, and to the approbation which the general principle of disestablishment had received—either to support the second reading or to abstain from rejecting the Bill at that stage. Those who adopted the latter course cannot certainly be accused of any want of candour or frankness in the view they took of the position in which they were placed. They stated very fairly that they intended to support the second reading; but that, at the same time, they considered that both justice and equity required that the position of the disestablished Church should be one much more favourable than the Bill contemplated, and that it was their intention, in Committee, to move or support Amendments which would have the effect of placing the disestablished Church in such a position as regarded its property as in their opinion it was entitled to hold. I recollect that a noble Friend of mine below the Gangway (the Marquess of Salisbury), whose speech, as everyone must remember, produced so great an impression on your Lordships, not only stated in general terms that this was his view, but even went into some detail as regarded the Amendments which he would be prepared to support. Well, what was the course which the Government took at that time? I recollect that speaker after speaker supporting the Government, and Members of the Government themselves, expressed the strongest approbation of the views of noble Lords on this side who on those terms were prepared to vote for the second reading. Nothing in their view could be more statesmanlike, nothing could show a juster appreciation of the position of this House than the opinions which those noble Lords then indicated. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) not only said it was his view that the Bill was subject to amendment in Committee, but, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, he stated that if Amendments were proposed—not merely Amendments which were acceptable to the Government, for Amendments of that nature are always received, but Amendments not acceptable to the Government—they would be considered by the Government with respect and attention. The noble Lord has said to-night that it was a very vague pledge. Well, I thought so at the time. He says almost any course of conduct might have been pursued after a pledge of that kind. That was just what appeared to me to be the case. Well, what is the course of conduct that has been pursued? The Amendments which would be proposed were perfectly well known long before they were placed upon the Paper. They had been more or less considered "elsewhere." They had been indicated on the second reading. They were proposed in Committee and were carried by large majorities. The Bill then went down to the other House. We have had some information from the noble Earl of what occurred there. According to the practice of Parliament our information—the information on which we are supposed to act—is limited to the Message we receive from the other House, and we have received a Message with regard to our Amendments, to which I will refer presently. What occurred in the other House when the Amendments were considered—what was said by the Prime Minister or by any other Member of the House—we have no reason to know and no right to refer to, except, indeed, as to the information derived from the noble Earl opposite. I will however say this—that it is one advantage of this rule which prevails between the two Houses that we know nothing except what is communicated formally of the proceedings of either House; that if anything were done in the other House which could bear the construction quoted by the noble Earl to the effect that our Amendments were rejected contumeliously or superciliously—even if the Prime Minister so far forgot what was due in point of respect to himself, and what was due in point of respect to your Lordships, as to state that your Lordships must necessarily be ignorant of the feeling of the country and of the constituencies, and must be regarded as persons in that exalted position which the noble Earl calls an aeronautical state—if the Prime Minister thought it worthy of himself and of the occasion to use language of that kind, at all events, we, from the advantageous rule to which I have referred, are happily ignorant of it, and have no right to take notice of anything but the Message which the other House has sent up to us. The noble Earl has counted the Amendments, and has counted those which were accepted by the House of Commons. Now, I remember several of those Amendments; they were Amendments made by your Lordships in clauses in which sentences wanted nominative cases, and I suppose they enter into the calculation of the noble Earl. I remember supplying some nominatives myself, and I am sensible of the compliment which the noble Earl was good enough to pay me when he said I had given assistance to the passing of the Bill. I think the English of many sentences was greatly improved in this House. I have not the least doubt that we made sixty-four Amendments, and that at least thirty-three of them have been accepted by the House of Commons. Whatever difference of opinion there may be on other subjects, I suppose we all agree that a sentence is the better for having a nominative case. But there are Amendments of some substance, involving something much more than the rules of grammar or correct diction; and what was the fate of those Amendments? Let us, my Lords, consider what they were. I find that as regards every Amendment of substance it received the general approbation of your Lordships. There were three in particular—one of which has been accepted, while two have been entertained by the other House and accepted with some modification. Let me remind your Lordships what they are. My noble Friend below the Gangway (the Marquess of Salisbury) proposed an Amendment which, I think, was essential to the good working of the Bill and to the efficacy of the future Church of Ireland—the Amendment referring to the relation of rectors and curates. As the Bill originally stood, the principle laid down was that there were certain ecclesiastical persons who were termed "permanent curates," whose annuities were to be deducted from the annuities or commutation of the rectors. The question whether these gentlemen were permanent curates or not was to be decided by the Commissioners, who were to inquire into all the circumstances of the living, its size, population, the state of health of the rector, the duty performed, the period during which a curate had been employed, and every other question which might enable them to form an opinion whether what I may term a chronic habit of employing a curate had prevailed. Now, the Amendment of my noble Friend—rightly as I think—severed the case of the curate from that of the rector; for absolute justice required that the compensation of the rector and that of the curate should be kept entirely distinct. But what is the concession which has been made upon this point by the other House of Parliament? The House of Commons has refused the Amendment severing the connection of the rector and the curate and their compensation, and has provided that for the future the test whether the curate is to be considered permanent or not, abandoning all the various considerations originally proposed, is to be this—whether during the last year the rector, in his return to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland, for the purpose of taxation, has claimed a deduction in respect of a curate. To show the beneficence of this Amendment I may point out that if an unfortunate rector during last year, travelling for his health on the Continent, should have been obliged to employ a curate during that time, and should have returned the fact, as he is entitled to do, to the Commissioners, he would thereby fix upon himself indelibly, and for the rest of his life, the permanency of the curate, and would have that curate's salary deducted from his income. Now, by a process of finessing which has baffled me, and which I think no one but an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer could have arrived at, it has been discovered that this concession, as the noble Earl calls it, amounts to something between £50,000 and £150,000, and the sum will fall to the Commissioners. Why, my Lords, this Amendment makes the Bill ten times worse than when it came up to us originally; for, in place of being a concession, it imposes on incumbents and rectors a burden which they have never known up to this time. What is the other concession for which we are indebted to the other House? A noble Friend of mine below the Gangway (the Earl of Carnarvon) proposed an Amendment on the subject of commutation, which I believe is absolutely vital to the efficiency and well-being of the Church, providing for a commutation on the principle of fourteen years' income. How was this Amendment dealt with by the other House? It was rejected. But another concession was made, and if these are concessions I must say I hope we shall have no more of the same kind. Your Lordships adopted fourteen years' commutation; but the Government have discovered that if you take 1,500 or 2,000 clerical lives, they being picked lives are worth more money, the chances of duration being much greater than with the same number of lives not selected in that way. They have found that this class of lives is 7 per cent more valuable than general lives, and the Prime Minister says no person had ever discovered that till the Government did so, and that it is owing to the anxiety of the Government to find out something for the benefit of the Church that the discovery has been made. Now, my Lords, I need not remind you that it was stated, over and over again in debate in this House, that that was the fact; but, as I understood, it was always controverted by the Government. But what is the result of this concession? Why, the Government, now proposing to commute the annuities of the incumbents at 7 per cent over the tabulated value, do nothing more than say—"We find we have been in error. We have been trying to force upon you a commutation which was unjust and unfair. We have been trying up to the present time to make you surrender your annuities for a sum of money below the value of them; and having discovered the mistake we had made and the unfairness we were attempting to practice upon you, we will not confess it to be an error, but we will rectify it and call it a concession for the benefit of the Church." That there may be no mistake I will read the words which, rightly or wrongly, are reported to have been used by the Prime Minister. I am told he said—

> "What we find is, that on an investigation of the respective values of ordinary lay lives and clerical lives, the clerical lives are worth in the market 7 per cent more than lay lives. This, as far as it goes, is a circumstance satisfactory to the clergy amid their many discouragements. If the clergyman's life is worth 7 per cent more than the ordinary lay life, it follows that you will have to continue his annuity for a correspondingly longer term; and the simple proposition I make to the House is this—that if we think commutation is desirable with a view to the complete success and despatch of this measure, it is wise, as on the other hand it is certainly equitable—indeed, equity almost requires it—that we should recognize that increased value of the annuity in the commutation which we offer as an equivalent to the annuity."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcvii. 1972.]

Now, that is very much as if the Prime Minister had said—"If you want to buy a particular article—if you think it right and advantageous to buy it—if it is necessary to the operation you have to perform that you should buy it—equity suggests, wisdom suggests, nay even equity requires, that you should pay the value for it." That is the principle on which this great concession has been made, and we are asked to accept it as a great boon which the House of Commons and the Prime Minister have offered. That is the second Amendment — what is the third? It is the one introduced in this House relative to private endowments. Now, the financing of the Government, in regard to these private endowments, really baffles the comprehension of ordinary minds. Your Lordships will remember that it was originally provided in the Bill that private endowments from the year 1660 were to be preserved to the Church. That was no great concession, for really I should have thought it—may we use hard words here?—simple robbery to take away the private endowments of the Church. Now, no person in the kingdom understood why the date of 1660 was taken, and we proposed to go back to 1560, the date of the Reformation. The Government did not venture to divide against that proposition; but in place of it they offered a lump sum of £500,000, as compensation for all these endowments, so as to avoid all dispute and difficulty and get rid of all litigation. Now, the ground on which the earlier date was proposed was the allegation on the part of the Church—whether right or wrong we cannot tell—that private endowments of great magnitude—one alone being worth £30,000 a year—were given to the Church anterior to the year 1660. Under these circumstances the compromise of the payment of £500,000 was offered. Surely that is not a concession; and the only way in which it is attempted to be made out a concession is this—The noble Earl assumes that on these private endowments there are life interests existing, that the holders of those life interests have their compensation, and that, notwithstanding those life interests being compensated, the £500,000 is to be paid down. The Government forget, however, that the £500,000 is paid in lieu of a very much larger sum which ought to have been paid; and, in the next place, I deny that there are life interests subsisting in a great part of these endowments. Some endowments, for instance, have been left for the purpose of applying the income to the repair of particular churches. Therefore, I venture my protest against a calculation which asserts that although the original value was £200,000 or £300,000, the Church is getting £500,000 in the shape of private endowments. These, then, are the concessions relied upon by the noble Earl. Then comes the argument so greatly relied on by the noble Earl. There is a great difficulty, according to the noble Earl, in arguing the question of disendowment either upon this or the other side of the House, for he says there is an idea on this side of the House that the question of re-endowment is to a certain degree still open, whereas he and his Colleagues are pledged to the principle of disendowment as well as of disestablishment.

Now, I am very sorry to be under the necessity of reminding the noble Earl of the opinion expressed by one of his Colleagues on this point. The opinion, indeed, was so clearly and ably expressed that none of us who heard it are likely to forget it, and it cannot be too often read in this House. I refer to the opinion expressed last year by the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll). The noble Duke said—

> "Nobody has ever proposed to deprive the Church of endowments derived from private benefactions. But more than this, under the scheme sketched by Mr. Gladstone, the Church is to be left in possession of the churches and parsonages, and of some land adjacent, so that it could not, in perfect strictness, be said that the Church, under that scheme, is to be wholly deprived of its endowments. Besides, it is at the option and discretion of Parliament to what extent disendowment shall go; and an uncertainty would be created if the word disendowment were introduced. Therefore those Members of the House of Commons who voted for that Resolution are perfectly free to vote for any sort of compromise in respect to the endowment of the Church."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 174.]

I apologize for having read this opinion to your Lordships once more; but let me now give one comment upon it in the way in which the finance of this Bill has been dealt with by Her Majesty's Government. I have already spoken of the magical manner in which figures can be used by an experienced financier, and I must say I have never seen a more singular proof of that dexterity than has been shown with regard to this Bill. What has been the course taken by the Prime Minister with regard to the finance of this Bill? Whenever he wants to tell you how great the property of the Church is he rates it at £16,000,000: but when he wants to show you how much he is giving to the Church he adopts a very different course. He says —"It is quite true that I talked of the property of the Irish Church being worth £16,000,000; but this sum was made up by the use of the public credit. It may be estimated that £4,000,000 is added by the use of the public credit—so that the value of the Church property is really only £12,000,000." Again, when the Prime Minister desires to show that the churches ought not to enter into the calculation, he says they would fetch nothing in the market, and are, consequently, of no value; but when he wants to show what the Church is receiving at his hands, he estimates their value at £3,000,000. Then, when he wishes to justify in the House of Commons his mode of dealing with life interests, he says that the right of a life owner to his income and property is sacred; that it is a freehold and cannot be touched. "This," says the right hon. Gentleman, "is a question of absolute right, and I must have £6,000,000 of the property of the Church in order to compensate those tenants for life. They must have that money as one of the terms of taking possession of the rest of the property." But then he turns round on the Church and says—"While I am paying off these incumbrances on the property I insist that the Church receives the £6,000,000. Besides this £6,000,000 you have £3,000,000 in respect of the churches, and the House of Lords has proposed to give you £2,000,000 more—so that, in fact, you go forth with eleven-twelfths of your whole property." Now, if figures can be dealt with thus, I must say I find it vain to follow them, and I think we had better put figures altogether out of the question. Let us, however, clearly understand what the result of the figures is. Three Amendments to which I have already referred were passed by your Lordships. With regard to the commutation, I do not believe that the Church, on any fair computation, could derive from it more than £1,000,000, and I think that sum represents exactly—and does not do more than represent, the value of the labour and risk which the Church would undertake by engaging in a large scheme of commutation. The sum would not be obtained by the Church but by individuals, and I do not accept but protest against the statement that it would amount to a gift to the Church of £500,000, at which figure it had been placed by the Prime Minister.

My Lords, I will not pursue further the subject of these individual arrangements with regard to the Church; but I will come at once to the few remarks I have to make as to the particular Motion which the noble Earl (Earl Granville) has submitted to your Lordships' consideration. The noble Earl has endeavoured to persuade your Lordships that in the Preamble as amended by this House there lurked the germ of concurrent endowment. Now, I entirely dispute the correctness of that statement. I shall not be accused by your Lordships of being a favourer of concurrent endowment. I have always opposed the principle, and the debates on the subject in this House have not altered my opinions. I ventured, however, to propose the alteration of the Preamble to the form which it assumed when it left your Lordships' House, but my object was certainly not to advance the cause of concurrent endowment. I will now state exactly what I think are the objections to the Preamble, taken in connection with the 68th clause, which has regard to the disposition of the surplus. I thought the objections to the Preamble were very grave indeed when the Bill was here before; but I think them still more grave since it has been returned from the House of Commons. The first objection which I make to the Preamble is this—It will be made to state that the funds of the Church shall be "held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any Church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion." Now, that is entirely at variance with your own disposition of the surplus funds of the Church in the provisions of the Bill. I say that the proposed disposition of the surplus is a disposal which necessarily involves the teaching of religion, and that you stultify yourselves if you assert that the disposition of the surplus under the latter part of the Bill is free from that objection. I say further that an objection to the Preamble and the 68th clause—an objection which has not yet been grappled with—is that it is proposed for the first time in the history of our legislation to place between £6,000,000 and £8,000,000 out of the control of Parliament, and within the exclusive control of the executive Government of the day, or of a Board even less responsible than the Executive Government of the day. It was said in this House on a former occasion, and with great truth, that no Member of either House of Parliament would ever dream of dealing in such a manner with £6,000,000 or £8,000,000 levied from the taxation of the country. Such a proposal never has been and never can be made. How, then, is it proposed to deal with the surplus? The 68th clause enumerates certain objects which are familiar to your Lordships—lunatic asylums, reformatories, refuges for the blind and the deaf and dumb. Among these institutions the income is to be divided in certain proportions to be declared by an Order in Council; and after the Order in Council is made, the administration of the income is to devolve on the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland—though the Bill states no rules to which they are to adhere. I do not forget the Amendment that has been made in the Commons—I will deal with that afterwards. Now, in the first place, what is the meaning of an Order in Council? We all know that it means an Order of the Government of the day; and therefore to say that a sum of £6,000,000 or £8,000,000 is to be distributed by Order in Council is equivalent to saying that the Prime Minister of the day shall have the disposition of that amount of money. Well, then, supposing it to have passed through the hands of the Prime Minister, it comes to the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland; and who are they? The first is the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant; and the second is the Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. There are a doctor of medicine and two very respectable gentlemen besides—and these are the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland. And it should be borne in mind that these Commissioners are chosen for the purpose of seeing that the various poor-houses in Ireland comply with the provisions of the various Acts of Parliament passed on the subject of Poor Law administration. That is the sole purpose for which they were made Commissioners, and the sole work they have to do, and this they are competent to do. But I want to know what competence or qualification or fitness they possess for dealing with lunatic asylums, reformatories, and refuges for the blind and the deaf and dumb, and what confidence we can place in their ability to deal with an income between £300,000 and £400,000 a year. By virtue of their office they have no right to control expenditure, they have never had any money under their care, and they would be entirely new to the business imposed upon them by this Bill. I desire to say nothing invidious of the non-official members of the Board, but it is extremely improbable that they will like to put themselves into antagonism to the Lord Lieutenant. So that, practically, an Order in Council means the order of the Minister of the day, to distribute this income according to the dictates of Dublin Castle. How does the Amendment propose to remedy this state of things? I wish to call your Lordships' attention to the phrase which has been introduced into it. In the 44th page of the Bill, in line 24, we have these words—

> "If the income of the property to be vested in the Commissioners shall, under the provisions of this Act, be applied by Order in Council before Parliament has legislated further in respect thereto, every Order in Council so appropriating the income of such property shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

Now, what is the meaning of the words "before Parliament has legislated further in respect thereto?" Is it not an admission at once on the part of the Government that they think it a natural and proper thing that Parliament should further legislate in regard to the disposal of this surplus? Is it not a proof that they were unable to put this Amendment in their Bill without confessing that the matter was not ripe for being acted upon until further legislation had taken place on the subject? But the matter does not stop there. If Parliament has not legislated, we are to have an Order in Council dealing with this income; that Order in Council is to be made in the name of the Sovereign, and is to lie on the table of Parliament for forty days, until the expiration of which it is to have no validity, and if there be an Address from Parliament in the mean time, it is to have no validity at all. I want to know whether that is a right position in which to put the Sovereign? Is it in accordance with constitutional practice and precedent to pass an Act of Parliament authorizing an Order in Council to be made in the name of the Sovereign professing to dispose of the income of this large fund, and then to say that the Order thus made in the name of the Sovereign is to have no validity for forty days, and Parliament is to be invited to put itself in antagonism with the Order made by the Sovereign in Council and to make it of no effect? Is that a proceeding consistent with the course of legislation in this country? Is that the way to deal with the solemn Acts of the Sovereign in Council—to declare that they are to have no force or efficacy, and to invite Parliament to render them nugatory? But we have some further information on this subject. Although we have not had much concession in the other House, we have had a considerable degree of new light thrown on the whole of this subject in the course of the debate in the other House. I believe that when the Bill was here before your Lordships were under the impression—I certainly was, and I suspect others were also—that through the medium of Orders in Council, or through the medium of the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland, there was to be some right of dealing not merely with the income of this fund, but with the capital. Now, we are told, as I understand, by the Prime Minister—and the wording of the Bill, I agree, runs in that direction—that the intention is, that there is to be nothing disposed of through the medium of Orders in Council, or of the Poor Law Commissioners in Ireland, except the income, and that the capital is not to be touched by them. But then there comes this most remarkable—I might almost say this astounding—statement from the Prime Minister—namely, that, although the income only is to be dealt with in this manner, this capital sum of £8,000,000—as to which it was such an object to close the whole matter this year, to have it put in such a state that no person could make any claim to it, to have it removed at once out of the range and area of debateable ground in Ireland as regarded its application—yet it is to be made, forsooth! re-productive—that is to say, as explained by the Prime Minister, that if anybody wants to improve the navigation of the Shannon, or to drain the Bog of Allen, or has a new plan by which fisheries off the coast of Ireland may be set on foot, or if any person thinks the best thing that could be done with this money would be to lend it to the Irish railways or in any other scheme, all or any one of these persons is to be entitled to come forward, and (to use the phrase of a noble Earl on the cross-Benches) to scramble for any number of years for the application of the principal of this fund! And the same Minister who permits and allows the principal sum to be thus scrambled for, tells you that it is of vital interest and importance to the welfare of the country that the interest of the fund should not be scrambled for! My Lords, if I were to go in for a scramble for money I should infinitely prefer scrambling for the principal to scrambling for the interest of a fund. I know very well what making advances of money re-productive in Ireland is; and, if I were an agitator, I should not desire anything better than to go in for such a scramble. And, as to the drainage of bogs, I venture to say that if the lunatics and the monthly nurses of Ireland are to wait for their share of the income of this fund until it is derived from the profits upon the draining of Irish bogs, they will have to wait a long time indeed. We are gravely told by the Prime Minister that we are to be asked on no account to leave open the appropriation of the income, while he himself leaves open all the time the question of the application of the principal, which he suggests may be used in a way that would produce no income at all. But, my Lords, even this remarkable proposal does not exhaust the fresh information that has been thrown upon the subject. I understand that, even since the Bill has left the House of Commons in its latest form, another view has presented itself of this matter. The Prime Minister has been asked—"What do you say as to the local application of these funds? These are Church funds, which do not come from all parts of Ireland alike; they come in greater amounts from one parish than they do from another; would it not be unfair to take no notice of the fact in the appropriation?" And the Prime Minister himself has been the first person to say that he should regard it as plunder to take the tithes of a parish in the South of Ireland, and apply it for the benefit of a parish in the North. Well, he was the other day asked whether he was to consider the place that this property came from in its re-distribution, whether he intended to give to particular places from the surplus in proportion to the contributions which those places made to it? The Prime Minister answers that he has not considered that point; he admits that if it can be done it would be very desirable to do it, but he says there is great difficulty in the matter, and that he lets it lie entirely open. In the mean time, what is the opinion of the House of Commons on the subject? I do not profess to have superior means of information on the point, but in the first place we have the admission made that this appropriation of the surplus was disposed of much too summarily when the Bill was in the House of Commons. In the next place, if I except the Members of the Government themselves, there was hardly a Member on either side of the House who stood up to declare himself in favour of the proposed appropriation of the surplus. I will not refer to the reports of the proceedings of the other House, which would be irregular; but I may allude to a letter written by a Liberal Member of the other House, and published in *The Times* of this morning; and in which the writer makes this astounding statement. He says—

> "As to my assertion, made in the course of the debate, that many Members, who afterwards voted for the clause, disapproved the proposed application of the money, I supposed that I was stating a fact sufficiently notorious to all. On Thursday last there was a large meeting of Irish Liberal Members, when I understand that the clause was almost unanimously, if not quite unanimously, condemned by the Members present, and a resolution was agreed to—only one or two Members being dissentient—in favour of the appropriation of the surplus to the development of the industrial resources of Ireland, and asking the Government accordingly to postpone the matter for a year. As an account of this meeting appeared in the *Freeman's Journal* of the day, which was then lying in the Commons' reading-room, I hope that there was no impropriety in my using the fact in the course of my argument, nor is the feeling of dissatisfaction confined to Irish Members alone."

Well, my Lords, the discipline of party was, no doubt, brought to bear, and it was worth a good deal. It may be that hon. Members felt constrained, urged by the Government — who wished the principal, but not the interest, to be scrambled for—it may be that they voted for the surplus clause, as it has been restored in the Bill; but, at all events, we have the statement contained in this letter, which has not been contradicted.

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: Who is the writer?

LORD CAIRNS: Mr. Morrison. He says the Irish Members came almost unanimously to a resolution in favour of postponing the appropriation of the surplus. My Lords, I am certainly in the full hope and expectation that your Lordships will adhere to your Amendments introduced into the Preamble and the 68th clause of the Bill. I believe that if you do so you will have the assent to that course of the great majority of this House. I believe, however the votes of the other House of Parliament may have gone, that you will also have the approbation of a great majority of the other House of Parliament. But whether that be so or not I feel satisfied that you will have the approval of the public out-of-doors. I do not believe the public out-of-doors approve this squandering of £8,000,000, which I do not believe would be squandered in the same way if it were raised by the taxation of the country. As to concurrent endowment, I maintain that that is entirely separate from this question of the postponement of the application of the surplus. A Motion directly raising the question of concurrent endowment was made in Committee in this House and negatived by a considerable majority. The proposal was again revived on the Report, and was carried, though only by a small majority. I agree with what the noble Earl (Earl Granville) has said as to that proposal having met with no favour in the other House of Parliament, where there was not even a division taken upon it; and I cannot believe that my noble Friend (Earl Stanhope), who moved that Amendment would feel much encouraged to ask your Lordships' House to adhere to its Amendment on concurrent endowment. I hope he will not ask this House to adhere to it. But I maintain that the question now before us is altogether distinct from that of concurrent endowment. I agree with the argument against concurrent endowment; but I should feel ashamed of the force of the arguments which I had to urge if, through fear and apprehension that at some future time the opinion I was combating might find favour, I was obliged to bury in a hole £8,000,000, lest somebody hereafter might be able to persuade Parliament to spend it in a way which I did not like. Therefore I maintain that this question is removed high and dry out of the atmosphere of concurrent endowment, and I ask you to leave this question of the surplus to the future disposal of Parliament, either as to its negative or affirmative application. I have heard it said —I know not whether accurately or not —that if this Amendment be adhered to by your Lordships, the Government will not proceed with this Bill, and will hold the Amendment to be fatal to the further progress of the measure. My Lords, I can hardly imagine that to be true. I think it would be the climax, not of logic, but of everything which is opposed to logic and reason. The Preamble and the surplus clause, as amended by your Lordships, leave the application of the surplus to Parliament—that is to say, to the Parliament of the future, the Parliament, if you like, of next year, of the year after, or of any year when the assent of Parliament is obtained to a decision as to its application. Now, I can hardly imagine that the Government, on account of an Amendment of this kind, would relinquish the Bill, the effect of which would be to do in a violent way what, at the worst, the Amendment itself would do in a courteous way.

My Lords, it may be convenient that I should say a very few words with regard to some other questions which more or less connect themselves with the order of Business; I have spoken already of the Amendments introduced by my noble Friends below me with regard to the curates, and also with regard to commutation. These Amendments I hold to be vital to the well-being of the Church, and I trust that your Lordships will adhere to them. There are some other Amendments of minor importance to which I wish to refer. I am as sensible as anybody can be how desirable it is to avoid any unnecessary collision with the other House of Parliament. I hold that as far as in reason it can be done, without surrendering our own convictions and our own right as an independent branch of the Legislature, we should not unnecessarily complicate a question of this kind with disputes without having grave reasons to urge for so doing. Now, there are Amendments as to the date of disestablishment originally placed in the Bill to which I would not recommend your Lordships to adhere. The 1st of January, 1871, was the date originally named; it was afterwards agreed to substitute the 1st of January, 1872. I suggested, by way of compromise, that the 1st of May, 1871, should be the date, and your Lordships accepted it. I should have thought that, if only with a view to the mere progress of the measure, that date might have been accepted by the other House, but on the Motion of the Prime Minister it was refused. I do not wish to lead your Lordships into a controversy as to these four months, and therefore I recommend that you should accept the Amendment.

Earl GRANVILLE was understood to say that he would support the reinsertion of the 1st of May if the noble and learned Lord wished it.

Lord CAIRNS: Well, my Lords, that of all things is to me the most surprising —that the Prime Minister should think to make it his "horse of battle," while the Leader of this House thinks the point utterly immaterial, and says that if your Lordships wish to insert the 1st of May he will support it. With regard to the Amendment as to the ecclesiastical tax, I put it to the most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) who proposed it whether, as it is admitted that there is a great deal to be said on both sides of the question, it would be right to make it one of the points on which we are to maintain our opinions as material against those of the other House of Parliament. Then as to the Ulster glebes—I myself have never been more satisfied of the justice of anything than of what was asked with regard to these glebes. I do not exaggerate the importance of the question however, because the money amount is not at all so large as has been represented. But I know there is a difference of opinion on the subject, and I think that we, who are responsible for the introduction of the Amendment, ought to be careful not to complicate the questions upon which there may be a difference of opinion between the two Houses, or to mix them up with those as to which there may be no difference among ourselves, Therefore, appealing to the judgment of the most rev. Primate who proposed this Amendment (the Archbishop of Canterbury), I should say that I do not think it one to which your Lordships need adhere. Therefore with respect both to the Amendment of the right rev. Prelate who presides over the diocese of Peterborough, and to that of the most rev. Primate with regard to the Ulster glebes, I should desire that your Lordships would not insist upon them. I would only say, in conclusion, that if, through any causes not under our control, legislation with regard to this Bill should not proceed to its ultimate completion, I desire to hold myself and those who act with me perfectly free to take any course we may think right on a future occasion.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I think it desirable, after the statement which the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) has made, to recall to your Lordships' recollection the precise Motion, which is now before the House—because the noble and learned Lord, pursuing a course which I admit was perfectly justified by the speech of my noble Friend (Earl Granville), has gone into various Amendments which are not immediately before you, and in the course of his speech, in discussing the question of the surplus, has forgotten the fact that we are discussing now only one portion of the Amendment which we made to the Preamble. ["No!"] The Motion made by my noble Friend is that the words—

> "Held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion,"

should be allowed to remain in the Preamble of the Bill.

Lord CAIRNS: There is no such Motion known to the practice of this House. The only Motion that can be made is that this House do or do not insist on its Amendments; and the noble Earl has proposed that this House do not insist on this Amendment. I propose to omit the word "not."

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I am rather surprised to find that the practice of this House differs so much from that of the other House. There it was possible to divide the Question into two parts, which was done for the convenience of the House—here it seems we must take the Question as a whole. But I have not the slightest desire to press that matter; I was merely anxious to point out that we should bear in mind that there was a particular question on which we were going to divide, and as far as the argument goes it makes no difference. The first part of the Preamble relates to those words which prohibit the application of any portion of the surplus to religious uses, and the second part relates to the application of the surplus to certain specified purposes. Now, what I wish to point out to the House is this — The noble and learned Lord opposite, from an anxiety which I think extremely natural in the Leader of a party, is desirous to obtain the votes both of those who may be of opinion that concurrent endowment is desirable, and of those who, not being of that opinion, yet think it desirable to postpone the appropriation of the surplus. But the noble and learned Lord carefully guarded himself from its being supposed that he was in favour of concurrent endowment. Now, supposing your Lordships strike out those words in the Preamble which prohibit the application of the surplus to any particular uses, and also that portion of your Amendments as to a precise scheme of concurrent endowment, will anybody regard it as anything else than as implying that this House intends to maintain the opinion which it has expressed in favour of concurrent endowment, notwithstanding the vote of the House of Commons with a majority of 124 against your Lordships' Amendment in the Preamble, and notwithstanding the fact that the Opposition did not venture to divide on the precise clause which relates to concurrent endowment? I should deeply regret that course, should it be taken by your Lordships, but it is not a course to which Her Majesty's Government can consent. Her Majesty's Government cannot consent to a distinct proposition that the application of this surplus may be made to religious uses, and it is for that reason that they desire that the words that have been objected to should be retained in the Preamble. The noble and learned Lord referred to a variety of other points raised by these Amendments. In the first place, he seemed to think that the Amendment made by the Commons with respect to the arrangement which this House proposes as to the compensation of curates is illusory. Now I wish to point out that, in point of fact, the Bill as it stands at present rather increases than diminishes the compensation which may be given to curates. There are three classes of curates now contemplated by the Bill. First of all, there are the curates whose salaries are deducted by the clergy in their returns to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and they are placed in the position of having their income deducted from the rector's incomes. There is, secondly, the class of permanent curates, who also will obtain compensation, to be fixed by the Commissioners. There is, likewise, a third class—the temporary curates—who will also be entitled to compensation. Therefore, with respect to the curates, the Bill is in a more favourable position than before. The number of curates to be affected by the Bill as it left this House would be exceedingly small; but that is not the case now. The noble and learned Lord referred to the Amendment of my noble Friend below the Gangway with regard to commutation, and said he should regard it as vital to the success of the Bill. That is an Amendment which the noble and learned Lord himself said gave a bonus of £1,000,000 to the Church—and I will not now stop to consider whether it does not give more, though we believe it would be more—I will take it at that. It is admitted then that this gives to the Church over and above the compensation on account of vested interests, and everything else given under the Bill, £1,000,000. I enter into no controversy as to the length of the lives, nor do I know by what process the noble and learned Lord arrives at his conclusion; but I say that, granting a bonus of £1,000,000 to the Irish Church is contrary to the principles on which the Bill is framed.

Lord CAIRNS: You give a bonus to Maynooth.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I deny that a bonus is given to Maynooth. ["Oh!"] I say that the compensation to Maynooth is not a bonus. If it is, why did not noble Lords opposite challenge us upon our dealing with Maynooth? I say the compensation to Maynooth is based on a perfectly fair average of all the life interests concerned, and my noble Friend's Amendment is not based on a fair average of the lives of the clergy affected by this Bill. The noble and learned Lord speaking of the application of the surplus said it was inconsistent with the words of the Preamble that the surplus should not be applied to the teaching of religion. The noble and learned Lord has not explained what were the arguments upon which he based that view; but I suppose he had in his mind the argument we have heard before, that because a certain number of reformatories were under the control of the Irish priests, therefore the teaching of religion would be indirectly involved in such a disposition of the surplus. This might almost be the case in the grants to reformatories; but surely the teaching of religion, as interpreted by this Bill, could not be involved in the granting of relief to the deaf and dumb. This is not a teaching of religion within the meaning of the clause—it is the relief of distress. You might as well say that grants in aid of workhouses supplementing the poor rates, must be said to involve the teaching of religion, because ministers of various denominations visited Irish workhouses and ministered to the spiritual wants of their co-religionists. The words in the Preamble mean what everybody means by those words—namely, that the surplus shall not be applied directly to the teaching of religion. If you were to say you must never apply money in any way which might become, even in an indirect manner, available for the teaching of religion, you would be demanding an impossibility. The noble and learned Lord seems discontented with the arrangement proposed in the Commons' Amendment, requiring that an Order in Council should lie upon the table for forty days before it shall come into operation; and he rather ridiculed the idea. The noble Lord behind me tells me he will have to move a slight Amendment to the proviso to make it more complete, but there is really nothing in the arrangement to cavil at. Indeed, a similar proviso exists in the Oxford and Cambridge Universities Act. Under that Act an Order in Council must lie on the table of both Houses a certain number of days before it can come into force. The noble and learned Lord was particularly severe on the noble Lord behind me because he said the alteration of the date from January to May was not a vital point in the Bill. Why, all along we said we should be guided by what we thought the true interests of the Church and the wishes of those who represent her. We had no wish to press any opinion of our own on this point; we merely said that there was great difference of opinion in the Church itself, and it seemed to us there was a predominance of opinion in favour of the earlier date. We, therefore, cannot set this up as a vital point. As far as I understand the noble and learned Lord, he does not support a very important Amendment made in the Bill with reference to the Ulster glebes, but that the Amendments with regard to commutation and giving the curates the compensation proposed by the noble Marquess opposite he does consider as vital. I also understood him to say that he supported the clause moved by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) giving to the clergy their glebe houses without payment, and lastly, not only to retain the Amendment made in this House as to the postponement of the surplus, but also to retain the words which distinctly convey to the country that it is the opinion of the House that the surplus is to be postponed, and one of the purposes for which it is to be postponed is that you may raise the question of concurrent endowment at any future time. ["No, no!"] I say that is so. If it be not so, why do you insist upon these words being struck out of the Preamble? If your intention be not as I have described it, you need not strike out the words ending, "nor for the teaching of religion;" it would be quite sufficient for your purpose to strike out the other words. The noble and learned Lord says the usage of this House does not permit you to divide the Amendment, and therefore you must strike out the words which refer to religious teaching. Now I say I am not in favour myself of applying this surplus to religious endowment, but I say also that the opinion of the country may possibly change; and I invite your Lordships to consider what would result from leaving the door open for demands to endow different religions. I therefore trust you will not take the unwise course of insisting on your Amendment.

EARL GREY: I submit that, according to the ordinary practice of the House, the Motion to be made and the Question to be put to us when we agree or disagree with the decision of the House of Commons with regard to Amendments made by this House—is that we insist or do not insist upon the Amendment we have made. The noble Earl who has just sat down (the Earl of Kimberley) says it is competent to us to divide the question, and I think the House is competent to do so when we intend ultimately to agree to part of the Amendment; and therefore it is perfectly within the power of the noble Earl to move that we insist upon the whole of any Amendment, or that we insist upon only so much of it as will end at a particular word. But if that be not his intention—if the noble Earl means that we shall withdraw the whole of our Amendment, I submit that it is entirely contrary to all the ordinary practice of the House that it should be divided in the manner he proposes; and I must say I do not see what object he has in view. My noble Friend seems to be very desirous of dividing the Amendment in order, in some way or other, to connect it with the question of concurrent endowment. Now, I say that there is no connection whatever between the two propositions. Suppose it be the intention of the House to adhere to the

Amendment proposed by the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) with regard to the glebes, which has been improperly described as "concurrent endowment," our agreeing to the Amendment made in the Preamble by the House of Commons would not be of the slightest consequence, because that part of the Preamble applies to what is left after the objects defined by the Bill are satisfied. But regarding it as having nothing to do with the subsequent proposition, I conceive we ought to insist upon this Amendment in the Preamble for good reasons. As I understand it, this House objected to the words which they struck out of the Preamble upon two grounds: in the first place, because they pointed to what was deemed to be an unwise allocation of an expected surplus of the property of the Irish Church; and, in the next place, because the words laid down one or other of two objectionable principles. The Preamble stated that no part of these funds was to be applied for the maintenance of any Church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion. Now, my Lords, it must have been intended by those words to assert one of two things—either a general condemnation of the system of applying public money to the religious instruction of the people, and a Parliamentary affirmation of the voluntary principle, and as applicable to England as to Ireland. The words must have been inserted either for the purpose of thus giving a Parliamentary recognition to that principle, or else as implying the opinion of Parliament that although there is no objection generally to the application of public money to the religious instruction of the people, there is an insurmountable objection if that religious instruction is conveyed through the medium of that religious denomination conformed to by the great body of the Irish people—namely, the Roman Catholic religion. Now, my Lords, we all know that, in point of fact, it was this latter view which commended these words to the great body of their supporters. We know, therefore, that, in point of fact, these words were intended to lay down this principle—that the Roman Catholic religion must be dealt with in a manner different from that in which we should deal with reformed systems of Christianity; and in that case this Bill, which professes to be brought forward upon the principle of religious equality, and to be intended to establish the rights of conscience, and put an end to a crying injustice which has been inflicted upon the Irish people as Roman Catholics—that Bill which professes to be brought forward with these high objects in view is really tainted—as was well said in the other House—with the very worst spirit of the old Orange ascendancy. My Lords, I say one or the other of these interpretations must be put upon these words, if we attach the smallest importance to them, because, if they were not intended as a Parliamentary recognition of one of those two principles, I ask what object do they serve? They have no legislative force—they do not in the slightest degree alter the legal effect of the subsequent clauses of the Bill. The striking out of the words of the Preamble would not in the least affect the provisions of the Bill, which would be equally binding on our future legislation, whether we strike out these words or retain them. Why, this whole Bill is founded upon the principle that one Parliament cannot bind another. We have heard over and over again that even the Treaty of Union cannot fetter the legislation of a subsequent Parliament. I admit the argument; I say that no one Parliament can bind its successors; and if it is good for the Treaty of Union it is equally good for this Bill. I say, then, the introduction of these words, unless they are meant as a Parliamentary declaration in favour of one of the two principles to which I have referred, is entirely useless. The question arises, ought we so to lay down one or the other of these two principles? I, for one, say we ought not. I say it is not fitting that the British Parliament should resolve that the voluntary principle is just and right, and that therefore we should by implication condemn the national Church of England; and on the other hand it is not fitting it should adopt words which can only be considered as a deep insult to the whole Roman Catholic population. In either sense, I say these words are altogether objectionable. Why is it they are used? Why do the Government lay so much stress on their retention? If they are to have no legislative effect—if they are by common consent powerless to alter the main provisions of the Bill—why do the Government take so much pains to insist upon their being retained there? It would appear to me that, if Her Majesty's Government desired to come to a conciliatory arrangement with this House, if they wished to remove any difficulty in the way of passing the Bill and of arriving at a settlement of this vexed question—when they found that these words were useless for any practical purpose, while at the same time they were justly offensive to many Members of this House, they would willingly consent to omit them. I say that would be a natural course if they desired, as regards this House, to pursue a conciliatory line of policy. But I much fear such was not their intention. I own I cannot look at their whole conduct with reference to this Bill without feeling impressed with the opinion—which I would gladly dismiss from my mind if I possibly could—that Her Majesty's Government are comparatively indifferent to the passing of this Bill, unless they can pass it in such a manner as to give a triumph over this House and to subject it to humiliation and degradation in the eyes of the public. Look at what they have done. As the noble and learned Lord behind me (Lord Cairns) justly said, nearly all your Lordships' Amendments that were of any importance have been rejected, or so altered as to make them of no value, and in some instances in minor matters Her Majesty's Government have actually gone out of their way to differ from this House. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) said he hoped your Lordships would not insist on the alteration in the date—but he also reminded you of the manner in which that alteration had been made. It had been proposed by himself, and had been acquiesced in by my noble Friend (Earl Granville)—the representative of the Government in this House. Surely, if there had been any desire to conciliate this House, at all events the Government might have accepted the Amendments which had been agreed to by their Colleagues in this House! The noble Lord who spoke last said that these Amendments were immaterial; but, surely, that makes the case much worse, as an indication of the spirit in which your Lordships' Amendments have been dealt with. That is exhibited not only in the alterations made in the substance of your Lordships' Amendments, but also in the mode in which those alterations have been effected. My noble Friend who introduced the subject this evening took great credit for the Prime Minister for the character of the speech he made when he brought your Lordships' Amendments under the consideration of the other House. I heard that eulogy on the speech of his Colleague with no little amazement. The impression which the reading of the speech produced upon me—and I am told it produced the impression still more strongly on the minds of those who heard it—was that it was not a speech made by a man who wished to conciliate and persuade. It was characterized by scarcely-veiled sneers at your Lordships' House, and it was pervaded by a tone of contempt which must be manifest to all who will read it. I must say these are facts we cannot leave out of sight in considering what we have to do with these Amendments. I am the last man to say that we ought not to make concessions if we can; but there are cases in which concessions are asked in a manner which gives them more importance than of themselves they deserve, and which renders it impossible to yield without loss of that honour which, whether to private individuals or to public bodies is one of the main elements of strength and independence. I cannot therefore think that the manner in which our Amendments have been dealt with, and the tone in which they have been spoken of, is altogether immaterial. I cannot for a moment suppose that when the subject is seriously considered by the other House of Parliament the insertion of these words in the Preamble is a point upon which it will insist. Is it really worth while to stand out on a point which does not in the least affect the substance of the Bill, and of which the only possible value is that it would inflict mortification upon this House, and compel it apparently to assent to principles of which it disapproves without any necessity for doing so? I cannot believe it to be possible; if it is, all I would say is, if the loss of the Bill should arise from this cause, no just and reasonable person will say the fault rests with us. My Lords, I think the course we have pursued with regard to this Bill shows that we, at all events, have done our best to arrive at a fair settlement of this question. Let me remind you of the manner in which you have dealt with this Bill. You know how very large a proportion of your Lordships entertained opinions certainly not favourable to the principle of the measure. I believe the number of those among you who would have willingly accepted that principle is exceedingly small. But we thought it our duty, in deference to public opinion, and looking to the whole course of this long controversy of five and thirty years' standing, to give the Bill a second reading. Having done so, we proceeded to consider it in Committee, and I think I am justified in saying that in Committee the clauses were most fairly and most fully discussed. We made many Amendments in the Bill; and although I cannot say that we sent it down to the House of Commons in precisely the shape I should have desired, I think that as it left this House it would have effected, on the whole, a fair and reasonable settlement of this vexed question. In acknowledgment of the claims of Roman Catholics we granted all that they asked with regard to disestablishment; and let it be remembered that we were often told that the great grievance of which they had to complain was the maintenance of a Church for a small minority of the population of Ireland, while the Church of the majority was wholly unrecognized by the State. The Established Church was absolutely and entirely swept away, and, by universal admission, no particle of that grievance was left behind. But more than that, we proceeded to disendow the Irish Church—although it is quite true that in adopting that principle we maintained that it was right that the Church should be left a certain portion of its property to enable it to make some small provision for the spiritual wants of the Protestant population of Ireland. We therefore so modified the Bill that we had reason to hope that some provision would be left which would enable the Anglican Church in Ireland to carry on its work at the expiry of the time during which it is to continue as an Establishment. My Lords, we did that in no narrow spirit, for if we had done so, we would have been unable to have justified our case. But whilst doing this we did not refuse to the other Churches the advantages which we claimed for our own. After a week's discussion in Committee we at length sent the Bill down again to the other House, containing clauses providing for the Presbyterians and the Roman Catholics a share —a fair share—of the advantages which we obtained for ourselves. My Lords, I deeply regret that this Amendment of ours has not been adopted. I am quite aware that we cannot now hope to see that scheme carried into operation, it having been carried only by a small majority in this House against the Leaders of both the great parties, and having failed to obtain any distinct support in the other House except from three or four individuals. The Amendment of my noble Friend (Earl Stanhope) will therefore, no doubt, be rejected, and I deeply lament it. I must say that Her Majesty's Government in causing it to be rejected have incurred a heavy responsibility. My Lords, it is the opinion of the great majority of the educated classes of this country—it is the opinion even of many of Her Majesty's Ministers themselves—that the proposal of my noble Friend would be the best settlement of the question. But, as I have said, it has been summarily rejected, without any serious discussion upon the merits of the plan—without even any attempt being made to show that the Bill, as we sent it back, was less calculated to promote the welfare of Ireland and the Empire than the Bill as we received it—and rejected, too, upon the plea that the country had already decided against it, and that it was impossible to carry it into operation. It appears to me that such conduct is hardly justifiable on the part of Her Majesty's Government. We have been told that this scheme of concurrent endowment was only brought forward at the sixtieth minute of the twelfth hour, and that it was a scheme akin to what was proposed by the Earl of Mayo. But this is not the case. What was then understood by concurrent endowment was some grant from the Consolidated Fund to give compensation to the Roman Catholics in consequence of their being excluded from receiving any share of the Irish Church property, which was to continue as before exclusively applicable to the Church of the minority. That was what was then understood, and that was what was rejected. But this proposal for considering the Irish Church property as a great fund for Irish purposes, and especially for teaching religion in the form in which it will be most acceptable to the people, is a proposition that has never been laid before the country, and has never been discussed at all. And yet we are called upon summarily to reject it on the ground that it has already been decided against by the people of this country. My Lords, is this the way in which great questions of this nature are to be disposed of? What, let me ask, is it that deters us from properly considering this question? There is nothing except certain speeches, delivered during the General Election by members of the Ministry, and others, in which the speakers pledged themselves to give nothing to the Roman Catholics. But is that a reason for dealing in the way we are asked to do with such a great question as this? Is it right, merely because certain persons thought proper in their election speeches to say that they would not approve of such a scheme, that Parliament should not deliberate upon a proposal which has for its advocates a very large proportion of the most intelligent of our fellow-subjects in England, Scotland, and Ireland? My Lords, I hold that such a thing is quite contrary to reason. I must however add this observation. When I was told that it was impossible to carry this measure in the form in which it passed this House, I asserted, without fear of being contradicted, that that impossibility consisted only in the determination of Her Majesty's Government. If they had recommended its adoption to the other House of Parliament, is there the slightest reason to believe that that recommendation would not have been adopted? We have heard that a meeting of the Irish Members was held to consider the subject, and that in that meeting there was a great preponderance of opinion as to the advantages that would arise from conferring this small boon upon the Roman Catholics. It was stated that a very large proportion of that meeting desired it; but that they, at the same time, held that they were bound in honour to support Her Majesty's Government in the course that they might think it proper to take. If, therefore, the Government had taken the other course, if they had recommended the adoption of the proposal, and if the Irish Members had said that, in their opinion, it was for the advantage of Ireland that it should be adopted, it would have been utterly impossible for the English and Scotch Members, whatever indiscreet speeches and pledges they might have been committed to, to have said, in a matter so deeply concerning the welfare of Ireland, that they would not consent to the scheme. Therefore let us not forget for a moment that the responsibility for this measure not passing in the form in which we proposed it rests with Her Majesty's Government and with Her Majesty's Government, alone; and that if we fail to bring this Bill to a happy issue—if we fail during the present Session to pass a Bill to settle this long controverted question, it will be because Her Majesty's Government have preferred to leave the whole question in suspense to passing a measure which the great majority of the people believe would have been better than the one they themselves originally introduced — because they reject an offer which, among the most impartial men, is regarded as fair and equitable. But although my strong feeling on the subject has compelled me to speak thus, I will not abandon the hope that this Bill may pass during the present Session. I am quite aware that for the reasons I have stated it cannot pass in the best form. I am quite aware that it cannot pass in the form in which I have the slightest hope that it will effect any real settlement of the question, because if you should not insist upon the Amendment proposed by my noble Friend, and if you should adopt every other Amendment made by the House of Commons, I say you will effect no settlement. By your refusal to assent to the Amendment of my noble Friend you will leave an important and an exciting portion of the question behind—one that if it does not arise next year, will be certain to arise in the course of the next few years. But even though the Bill will not be calculated to confer all the advantages which I should wish, I still hope that it may pass in such a form, that it may do, at all events, much of the good which we expect from it—because I cannot conceal from myself that the failure of this Bill will be nothing short of a public calamity, while it will be no consolation to me to know that for that calamity Her Majesty's Government will be mainly responsible. That calamity, I trust, may be averted; and it is because I hope the confusion and ill-feeling which, on the failure of this Bill will prevail for the next few months, may be averted that I have heard with great pleasure the declaration of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), that it is his intention to modify his Amendments somewhat when they are reached; and without anticipating the discussion upon these Amendments, perhaps I may be permitted to express a hope that, upon further consideration, he will carry his concessions further than it appears he at present contemplates, in hopes of achieving what I desire. I beg to assure the noble and learned Lord that it will be good policy for him to follow the course I recommend. Our endeavour should be to draw a contrast between the spirit in which we have dealt with this measure and the spirit in which it has been dealt with by the other House, so as to assure the country that if it fails it is certainly not our fault, and that we, at all events, have done all in our power to secure its passing.

Viscount HALIFAX: I have no intention of following my noble Friend in detail in the arguments he has addressed to your Lordships upon the policy pursued by the Government. I believe I shall best consult the convenience of your Lordships by confining my observations to the Amendment now under consideration. But, at the outset, I must say a word upon its form and substance. My noble Friend (Earl Granville) has moved that your Lordships do not insist on your Amendment in the Preamble as far as the word "religion;" but the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) says my noble Friend can make no distinction between one part of the Amendment in the Preamble and another, but must take the whole Amendment. [Lord Cairns dissented.] My noble Friend below me moves that your Lordships do not insist on so much of your Amendment as contains these words—

> "Held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor forthe teaching of religion."

And I understand the noble and learned Lord opposite to object to that Motion.

Lord CAIRNS: I said you must not take the Amendment word for word or sentence by sentence and divide on it in that way; but that you ought to take the Amendment as a whole, unless you objected to one part and agreed to another part.

Viscount HALIFAX: I must say that in this particular case the reason for doing otherwise than the noble and learned Lord suggests is patent and evident, because the two parts of the Amendment made by your Lordships deal with totally distinct and different questions. More than that, the course recommended by my noble Friend is the one pursued in the other House of Parliament when that House was dealing with the Amendment. We are not bound within the four corners of the Message sent up from the House of Commons. I am not going to refer to speeches made in that House, because I think that would not be a very convenient course; but it is perfectly regular to refer to the proceedings of the House of Commons as they appear on the Votes; and on doing so I find that the House of Commons dealt with this Amendment as raising two separate and distinct questions. Though a young Member of your Lordships' House, I venture to think your Lordships can do the same thing. The practice of the two Houses cannot be so different as to involve this gross absurdity, that what raises two questions in one House must of necessity be dealt with as one in the other House. Having said so much on the point of Order, I may express my concurrence with my noble Friend who last addressed the House that, for any practical purpose, as far as this Bill is concerned, it makes very little matter whether the words are or are not retained in the Preamble. They bind us to nothing; they commit us to nothing; they decide nothing. I do not think that the proposal made by my noble Friend the noble Duke below the Gangway (the Duke of Cleveland) was inconsistent with the words in the Preamble. I refer to the proposal for giving glebes to the ministers of other denominations than those of the Irish Protestant Church. When the Bill came up here from the Commons originally the Preamble stated that—

> "After satisfying so far as possible upon principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland all just and equitable claims, the property of the said Church should be held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

The framers of the Bill and the House of Commons have considered it to be quite consistent with the principle expressed in these words to allow the clergy of the Irish Protestant Church to purchase their glebe houses, and a certain quantity of glebe land for an amount less than they are avowedly worth. This is, in point of fact, giving to the clergy, towards their maintenance, the difference between the actual value of the property, and the sum which they are required to pay. Now it is obvious that, as a matter of principle, it is no more a violation of principle to give the whole than to give — say — the half of the value. The Amendment, made in your Lordships' House, gave the houses and some glebe land to the Protestant clergy without payment, and I cannot consider that this was any violation of the principle laid down in the Preamble. But if it was consistent with those words in the Preamble to provide glebes for the clergy of the Irish Protestant Church, I do not see how providing the clergy of the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Churches with glebes could be inconsistent with them. I look upon it that the prohibition contained in the last part of the sentence I have quoted has reference to the disposition of the surplus—

> "After satisfying so far as possible upon principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland all just and equitable claims."

If glebes are provided for the Protestant clergy, the principle of equality which is laid down in the Preamble requires that glebes should be given to the clergy of the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Churches. I do not wish, in the slightest degree, to raise the question of these glebes again, though I believe nothing will convince the Roman Catholic population in Ireland that they are treated on terms of equality with the Protestants as long as they see these Protestant clergy provided with well-built houses, while their priests are living in quite another and very inferior description of dwelling. I cannot but fear that the omission of any provision for this purpose will defeat the whole object of the Bill. But we have urged that view to the best of our ability —a majority of 33 in your Lordships' House decided against us, and though that vote was subsequently revoked by a majority of 7, the House of Commons refused to agree to the proposal. We have done what we could in the matter, and as the House of Commons has rejected our Amendment I think we ought to make the best of the Bill as it stands. Now, my Lords, while holding that those words are not of any great practical value in themselves, I believe that maintaining them in the Bill would tend to prolong that feeling of uncertainty and that spirit of agitation which it is the interest of all parties, and not least of the Irish Church, to put an end to as soon as possible. It is totally impossible to deny that there is a very strong feeling in this country against what is called "concurrent endowment." I do not myself hold that these words "concurrent endowment" are properly applicable to the proposal made by the noble Duke. They were properly applicable to the proposal made by Mr. Pitt in the beginning of the present century; and they were properly applied, perhaps, to the proposal of Lord Mayo, which was understood to be one for leaving the Irish Protestant Church in possession of all she had, and "levelling up" as it was termed as to the other Churches. This "levelling up," of course, could only have been done out of the taxation of the country. From that source it was that those other Churches must have been endowed. That course I never considered to be possible. I believe that to be the concurrent endowment on which an appeal was made to the country and against which the country gave a decided and decisive verdict. I say, with submission to your Lordships, that the tone taken in your Lordships' House led people to believe that concurrent endowment was proposed here. My noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) argued the question of concurrent endowment on its highest ground; and so thoroughly did this idea prevail, that even the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) though alive to the objections to the use of the words "concurrent endowment" could not avoid letting them escape from his lips. Now, my Lords, if that be so, I am very much afraid that if we omit these words it may be held that we are still looking to concurrent endowment. Your Lordships may recollect that the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) used the argument in favour of holding over the surplus, that if that proposal were accepted the surplus might, at some future time, be applied to the purposes of concurrent endowment, although he was not in favour of such an application of the money. I am afraid, therefore, in the present excited feelings that prevail in some of the most populous districts of the country, that unless we retain these words the belief will be entertained that we are covertly but firmly intending at some future period to apply the surplus to the purposes of concurrent endowment. My Lords, I entirely concur in the whole scope and object of the Bill. I concur entirely in the disendowment and the disestablishment of the Irish Church; and I should be very sorry were we for no practical purpose to do any act that would tend to prolong the excitement and the agitation upon a subject in which the feelings of the people are so deeply concerned. I hope and trust, therefore, that your Lordships will not insist upon the omission of these words down to the word "religion." I will not, at the present moment, refer to the second part of the Amendment, but I do believe that, if we wish to contribute to the peaceable settlement of this question, and to avoid exciting a bad and a hostile feeling in the great mass of the people, we shall assent to the proposal of the noble Earl below me and not object to retaining these words.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE: My Lords, I do not regard the words it is proposed to omit as being of much importance in themselves. Although they may be regarded in the light of a declaration which I am sincerely sorry to see inserted in a Bill of this kind, they enact nothing, and therefore I shall, on considerations entirely without reference to concurrent endowment, vote for their retention. While it is but right that we should, when necessary, stand upon our own dignity, still we should avoid every unnecessary conflict with the other House of Parliament, and where a conflict with that body is inevitable we should only proceed upon good and substantial reasons. The noble Lord (Viscount Halifax) has pointed out the reasons why great importance is attached to the retention of these words throughout the country by a very large and powerful party to which we greatly owe the introduction of this Bill. I allude to that party which desires to establish in the United Kingdom the voluntary principle. What benefit can accrue from the retention of these words I confess I am unable to perceive. What would be said of a man who, having accidentally acquired a large property, were to announce that not 1*s.* of it would he apply to the purposes of religion? And even if we do consent to their retention, I believe they will be quite inoperative; because in the event of the surplus being applied to the purposes proposed, those who instruct the blind, the deaf, and the dumb will have to teach those so afflicted religion, and will have to be paid for doing so. However that may be, seeing that the House of Commons and a large party throughout the country attach so much importance to these words, I shall yield my own opinion upon the subject, and shall vote for their retention. Before I sit down I wish to say a few words upon the question of the postponement of the application of the surplus. Upon that question I recommend your Lordships to stand firm. You have the sense of the country with you—you have common sense with you—and it seems to me that it is only in order to go against and humiliate this House that the rational proposal you have made that the consideration of the application of the surplus should be postponed has been rejected. Did any man ever bind himself as to what he would do with a fortune he was to come into four or five years hence? If it is said that the reason for tying up the property at once is to prevent future discussion respecting its disposal, I say that it will have exactly the reverse effect. It is not with any view to concurrent endowment that I venture to ask your Lordships not to assent to this proposition. I look upon the Established Church in Ireland as completely gone, and I also look upon concurrent endowment as completely gone. However wise and judicious such an arrangement might have proved—and I believe it to have been a great mistake not to have adopted it—yet I believe the feeling which has destroyed the Established Church in Ireland to be too strong to permit concurrent endowment to be accepted as a principle for many years to come. But, whether such be the case or not, I think it would be against all common sense if we were to attempt to appropriate property which we shall not get into our hands for several years to come to any specific purposes at the present moment. To the appropriation of the surplus for the specific purpose indicated, I, for one, have no particular objection, but I think that, at the present moment, it would be most unwise to decide upon the appropriation of it to any specific purpose whatever. I say that in postponing the application of the surplus for the next few years you will have the unanimous support of the country. For these reasons, and entirely apart from the question of concurrent endowment, when the proper time arrives I shall vote in favour of the postponement of the appropriation of the surplus. On the other hand, I hope that your Lordships will seriously consider the position in which you are placed with regard to this Bill. Considerable concessions have been made by the other House of Parliament, and I hope that your Lordships will also make such reasonable concessions as it may be in your power to grant. It is in this spirit that I shall record my vote in favour of the retention of the words in the Preamble re-inserted by the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY: My Lords, I shall only address a very few observations to your Lordships upon the question before the House. At no time during the debate upon the Bill, nor during the discussions in Committee, did I venture to utter a single syllable with reference to this measure, nor should I undertake to address your Lordships now were it not for the deep conviction I entertain of the gravity and the importance and the danger of the crisis in which we are now involved. My Lords, I cannot help feeling the policy and—I say it with great regret — the necessity of our accepting the propositions of the House of Commons. I do not say this out of any affection for this Bill, because I regard it as being altogether the most revolutionary measure that has come under our consideration for many generations, and as calculated to produce, and that shortly, still larger changes in the existing relations between Church and State, in religion and in property, than any measure that has been laid before this country since England was a nation. But, my Lords, however wise or however unwise, however perilous, however wild the Bill may be, the country has made up its mind upon it, and the country is determined, at all hazards, to have the measure as it stands. We have to deal, as regards this question, not with the House of Commons—for that would be an easy and a simple matter if we had a portion of the country with us — but with the nation at large. Now, I think that your Lordships are placed in a worse position than you were some weeks back in your endeavour to offer resistance to these Amendments. The vote that was given by this House by a majority of 7 on the subject of concurrent endowment produced more anger, grief, and consternation in the country than any vote that is recorded in the whole history of Parliament. That vote was looked upon, not only by those opposed to "the endowment of error" as it is termed, but by those opposed to endowments of all kinds, as being an endeavour on the part of your Lordships to extend the system to which they have so great objections, and the result has been that it has very seriously injured your Lordships' position in the estimation of the country, and I have no doubt that it has even still more seriously injured the position of the Bishops, and the safety of the Established Church. I fear, my Lords, that we shall, as a consequence of this, have a cry not against concurrent endowment, but one that hereafter will arise universally in favour of concurrent disendowment throughout the whole of the British Empire. That, my Lords, is what we have looming before us, and it is a cry which may be echoed over all Europe. To prevent the possibility of such a step, by rejecting this Bill, we cannot save the Established Church of Ireland, nor even a shred of it. The fate of that Church is just as clear and distinct as anything can be that has not been actually accomplished, but by rejecting this Bill we may very much aggravate the misery and the danger of our situation. I am certain, from the knowledge I possess of the feelings of the middle classes and of the great mass of the people in this country, and of those who constitute the new constituencies which you have just called into existence, that their minds are fixed upon the passing of this measure, and that in the event of its being rejected by this House, one offering far less advantageous terms for the Church of Ireland will be shortly presented for our acceptance. My Lords, I implore you not to add to the imminent dangers of the situation in which we are now placed, the further charge of entering into a conflict with the country, which may result in the overthrow of other institutions than the one which this measure proposes to destroy.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I cannot refrain from addressing some observations to your Lordships after the remarks which have been made in the course of this debate, and especially after the address of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury), who has touched the question of concurrent endowment boldly. The question appears to me very much in this light. I am ready to give my assent to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and also to its disendowment, considering that the payment of the clergy is part of an Establishment. I will even go further, and say, that although I think the Established Church of Ireland has been hardly treated by the Bill which has been sent up to us, and although I think it is a very different thing to have a Church which from the beginning has been a voluntary Church, and to have a Church which has always been an Established Church, disestablished and disendowed and sent out into the world without adequate provision—yet, though that is my opinion, I confess I would rather assent even to the harsh provisions which have been sent up from the House of Commons, I would agree to every article of disendowment contained in the Bill, rather than lose the Bill altogether. I believe it would be better for the State, and better also for the Church of Ireland, that the Church should go out very partially endowed rather than that the Bill should be lost altogether. But having assented fully to disestablishment and disendowment as proposed by the House of Commons in the name of the country, there is this further question which I am obliged to encounter. We find, according to the Preamble, as sent up from the House of Commons, that the property hitherto belonging to the Irish Church is to be held and applied—

> "For the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

Now, I ask, in the first place, what is the necessity, for the purpose of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Ireland, to place in the Preamble any such declaration? It appears to me, I confess, a gratuitous, unnecessary, and imprudent declaration. I have seen it stated, on the authority of a Member of Parliament with whom I am well acquainted—on the authority of Mr. George Melly—that the result of the last elections was against any religious endowment whatsoever—that is to say, it was not against the endowment of the Church of Ireland, as representing only a minority of the people, but it was against the endowment of the Church of Scotland and against the endowment of the Church of England. I say, then, to my noble Friends, if that is the question which is meant to be raised indirectly by this Preamble—if it is meant to entrap your Lordships and to entrap the Crown, the House of Commons, and the country into a general declaration against religious Establishments, let us have that question fairly put; let us have the issue openly and intelligibly raised; and let us have the proposal itself placed, in words that cannot be mistaken, upon your Lordships' table. For the reasons I have stated, this declaration contained in the Preamble appears to me to be imprudent as well as unnecessary. But, in the next place, who is to be bound by it? Observe how easily some people will escape from the meaning which others will strive to attach to the words. Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Miall, and others, who are against all Establishments, will say they have obtained a great triumph in the insertion of this declaration in the Preamble. In the Motion which was proposed the other day for granting glebe houses and residences to the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian clergy, it was contended by my noble Friend (Viscount Halifax) that this was not concurrent endowment. I agree with my noble Friend in that interpretation; but I believe the greater part of the country have affixed to our vote the name of concurrent endowment, and my noble Friend who spoke last (the Earl of Shaftesbury) is afraid of dissensions and of the great cry which would be raised in the country by legislation in any such direction. My noble Friends on the Government Bench endeavour to fix upon us the charge of insincerity because we agreed to that proposal; but I must say that I think the Government have themselves helped to create great confusion in this matter by the words they have introduced into the Preamble, declaring their willingness to satisfy, "upon principles of equality, as between the several religious denominations in Ireland, all just and equitable claims," and at the same time that the funds are not to be applied "for the maintenance of any Church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion." How are these propositions to be reconciled one with the other? The Government are ready to put any interpretation that suits them upon these words. If noble Lords opposite say, as they have frequently said, that to give fourteen years' capitalization of the yearly grant to Maynooth is to give a fresh endowment to that College—the Government reply, "Not a bit of it; we are satisfying, upon principles of equality, a just and equitable claim." In the same way, if we give—as I should be disposed to do—glebe houses to the clergy, or give them for £200,000 less than they are worth, as was said by my noble Friend the Secretary for the Colonies—that I look upon as a very just and proper endowment of a clergy who have always been respected, and whom you are now going to turn loose upon the world. The limited proposal, however, which the Government favour is not, according to their view endowment, but the satisfying of a just and equitable claim. But when we say, give the same kind of advantages to the Roman Catholic parish priests and to the Presbyterian ministers—satisfying, upon principles of equality as between the different religious denominations in Ireland, this just and equitable claim, then the Government turn round and say—"Oh, no, that is not a just and equitable claim; that is concurrent endowment of different religions"—so that we are always confused and embarrassed by these various interpretations of what appear to me points depending upon the same principle. Your Lordships have been very much censured, and even ridiculed, for your supposed ignorance of the feeling of the country and the practical affairs of life; and your Lordships have been compared to men "up in a balloon," who do not know what is passing upon the face of the earth. Well, I have lived for a long while, and I have passed I admit, much of my time in England; but I have always supposed that the noble Duke (the Duke of Leinster), whose Spartan brevity is so highly valued in this House, and that the noble Baron (Lord Athlumney), who for some time held the post of Chief Secretary for Ireland, living constantly in that country, attending to their large estates there, speaking daily to the clergymen of the Established Church, to the Roman Catholic priests, and to Presbyterian ministers, to landowners, farmers, men of all positions of life in Ireland—I should have supposed that these men, at least, would have known something of the feeling of that country. For my own part, I paid great deference to their opinions; but now we are told that they are men living in a balloon, and that nobody except the First Lord of the Treasury and the President of the Board of Trade have real practical notions respecting Ireland. I must say, my Lords, that I was much more astonished than convinced by such an assertion. I am not all sure that your Lordships would do wisely to listen to those counsellors who tell you they are so intimately acquainted with Ireland, and to neglect the advice of the noble Duke and of many noble Lords opposite who are well acquainted with the wants and wishes of that country. Why should not the Government be satisfied with their proposals for disestablishment and disendowment without proceeding to make abstract declarations, which are always extremely dangerous, and which may lead to a general disendowment of all Establishments throughout the world? You may rely upon it that there is on the Continent of Europe, in France, Prussia, Austria, and many other countries, a large party who say that there ought to be no endowment of religion; and when they see it proposed to place in the very front of this Bill a declaration that no religious teaching shall be supported out of a fund which for more than 500 years has been specially devoted to religious purposes, is it not probable that the agitation against endowment on the Continent of Europe, as well as in England, Scotland, and Ireland, would be helped forward by our adopting such a course? We were told the other day by the Lord Privy Seal that there had been a great advance of late towards the voluntary principle in religious matters. If that be so, let the principle be openly raised—let us fight in a fair field; but do not let it be said that Parliament is committed by a declaration in the Preamble of a Bill. With regard to the proposition for reserving the surplus, some Members of the Government have endeavoured to frighten the Parliament and the country out of it by saying that it means concurrent endowment. I say, however, that it does not mean concurrent endowment. Nay, further, I assert that concurrent endowment has not yet been regularly proposed. I think the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) made a very just remark on a former occasion when he said he was himself opposed to concurrent endowment; but that if at some future time the country should be of opinion that concurrent endowment was wise and proper, why should those who were in favour of the scheme be debarred from the opportunity of bringing it forward? Nothing could be more moderate than that declaration. We are told by the Members of the Government that it is impossible for them to approve concurrent endowment because the country is so much against it; but they do not say that the scheme is in itself unreasonable, or that it might not prove beneficial in Ireland. They say that the country is very much opposed to the project, although in the same voice and tone they say—"Do not agree to this proposal, because hereafter the country may be in favour of concurrent endowment, and we want to have a perpetual power of preventing that scheme being carried out." Can anything be more inconsistent than this? The Government has proposed—and, in my opinion, very properly—to do away with what was formerly regarded as an essential part of the Act of Union between England and Ireland. They say that the times have changed since that Act was passed, that the conditions of the country have altered, that the political spirit of the present day is unfavourable to the continued Establishment of the Church in Ireland, and that therefore they have a right to alter the Act of Union. Yet the very same men who proposed the alteration of that Act are now afraid lest the opinion of the country should hereafter change and become in favour of concurrent endowment, and therefore they propose an enactment which shall be binding for all time to prevent concurrent endowment. For my own part I have no desire to carry concurrent endowment against the wishes of the country, and I do not expect that in my time the country will ever be in favour of it; but that is no reason why we should agree to the proposal contained in the 68th and 69th clauses. It must be remembered that the majority of 120 votes which usually supported the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on this measure dwindled down to 72 when this proposal was made. This shows, at all events, that there was a good deal of doubt on the subject. I was very much struck with the report of a speech by a Roman Catholic Gentleman (Mr. Maguire) in the other House, who declared on the part of his co-religionists that he did not wish to see the Roman Catholic Church endowed. This was very fair; but when I read the speech further I found that the hon. Gentleman who represented the city of Cork, remarked that he should be glad to see a portion of the surplus devoted to the improvement and extension of the Blind Asylum and Lunatic Asylum in Cork. Now, I ask you to look at what has lately taken place in France. In France an official candidate at an election is favoured by the Government giving him an order for a grant for some local job, and the Prefect tells the electors that they must vote for him because he brings a great subsidy for local works. Might not a similar course be adopted in Ireland? I remember being told long ago of a conversation that took place between Mr. Fox and a person who was about to go to Ireland to fill the very high office of Lord Lieutenant, who said that if he went there he hoped he would be allowed to take measures to put an end to jobbing. "Of course," Mr. Fox replied; "you may do what you please on the subject; but as to inducing the Irish to give up jobbing, you might as well ask them to speak without a brogue." By the declaration in the Preamble of this Bill, and by the 68th clause, you make a disposition of public money which will give rise to more jobbing—I do not say than ever has prevailed in Ireland—but than has prevailed there for the last twenty or thirty years. These are objections to the words of the Preamble and to the 68th clause, which seem to me to be very strong objections, and I shall therefore feel it my duty to vote with the noble and learned Lord in respect to them. With regard to the giving of compensation to the clergy for their vested interests, I hold that such compensation is no more than what they have a positive right to. Blackstone says that the parson has a freehold in his tithe, his glebe, and his parsonage. Well, you cannot take away his freehold without giving him the value of his life interest in it. It has happened to me, as it no doubt has to others of your Lordships, to have a railway company take a bit of my land from me. I asked the company if they took my land to pay me for it at its true value, and they immediately did so; I did not feel bound to be grateful to the railway company. And so you must pay to the Irish parson proper compensation for the freehold you are about to take away from him. It is not an act of generosity, but an act of mere justice to do so; and your Lordships surely would not be less just than the railway companies all over the country.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, I am so strongly impressed with the gravity of the position in which we are all now placed, that I think it is the first duty of every Member of the Government to resist the temptation to be betrayed into the use of any language savouring of violence or injustice, even although language should be addressed to us which we think most violent and most unjust. And I am sorry that I am obliged to notice, which I shall do with calmness, some of the language which fell from my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey). I know that my noble Friend is the chartered libertine of debate, and I assure him that nothing which ever falls from him can have the effect of irritating me, because I know the peculiarities of his vocabulary; but I did think that on the present occasion he violated the ordinary decencies of debate. My noble Friend told Her Majesty's Government that he verily believed it was their design and their desire to bring on a conflict between the two Houses of Parliament, with a view to damage some of the most fundamental institutions of the State. I say, my Lords, that if there was one grain of truth in that accusation, we should deserve not only to be dismissed as a Government, but to be impeached at the Bar of your Lordships' House. My Lords, I will only say this—and your Lordships may believe me or not, as you please—but I say it in the face of this House and in the face of the British and the Irish people, that it has been the earnest and anxious desire of every Member of the Government, without exception, to meet this House to the utmost possible extent that was consistent with the principles on which we had gone to the country, and with which we had secured before the country a majority unprecedented in the present century. My Lords, what were the principles with which we went to the country? We went to the country on the principles of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church; and along with these and placed in the front rank with these—in a secondary rank, but along with them—we went upon this third principle, that there should be no re-endowment for the various religious bodies in Ireland. You may choose to take offence at the very innocent language used by my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government with regard to the comparative position of this House in respect to a knowledge of the feeling of the country; but do your Lordships mean to say that we, the Members of the House of Peers, who are not compelled to go to the hustings in any part of the country, who are not placed in immediate contact with the electoral body—do you think that we have that degree of sensitiveness to the feelings of the electoral body which is felt by the Members of the other House of Parliament, who are compelled to that trying ordeal? My Lords, among all sentient beings there is none so sentient as the Member of a House of Commons in a state of dissolution. He knows exactly, when he mounts the hustings, what he can and what he cannot stand upon before the electoral body; and when a new electoral body has been created by the act of the Conservative party, and when, by the acknowledgment of a Conservative Government, upon this and upon no other question was the appeal made, are you going to deny the verdict which the country has given, and which has been expressed through such an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons? Then, my Lords, I say that the verdict of the country was as distinct and emphatic against concurrent, or, as I call it, indiscriminate endowment, as it was in favour of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. I can conceive the argument used by the noble Viscount on the Bench above me (Viscount Halifax), and by other noble Friends of mine on this side, the other night, that the mere giving of glebes to the various religious bodies did not amount to what might be called concurrent endowment; and I listened to the speech of a noble Lord (Lord Athlumney) behind me with that deep attention which I am sure every noble Lord then present listened to it—a speech which I may say almost persuaded me to be in favour of the proposal that he advocated. No man better knows the Irish people than that noble Lord does, and if we could manage this matter as the noble Duke (the Duke of Leinster) does on his own particular estates, I think we should be bound to try the experiment generally. But I cannot help observing that the anecdote which the noble Duke told us led to this—that the giving on easy terms of bits of land to the clergy of the various religious bodies was a course to be left to the action of private individuals rather than that Parliament and the State ought to enter on that field of debate and of action. But I would appeal to my noble Friend behind me, and to the noble Duke and others who have been in favour of concurrent endowment to this very limited extent—I would ask them whether they do not agree with me that the position of that question has been materially altered since it was debated in this House? In the first place, I appeal to them whether concurrent endowment, as sanctioned by the majority in this House, was sanctioned on the grounds on which they would recommend it? I believe there were hardly twenty Members of this House who were in favour of concurrent endowment on that very philosophical, philanthropic, and, possibly, statesmanlike view on which it was supported on this side of the House? Is it pretended that the majority by which that vote was carried was not mainly composed of the Conservative side of the House? And how have they come round to the idea of concurrent endowment? Is it not notorious that up to the eleventh hour—up to the last moment—they had resisted 1*s*. of the property of the Irish Church being taken from it? Is it not positively clear that the vote of this House in favour of concurrent endowment was obtained by the obvious truth that it was intended to cover a large re-endowment of the disestablished Church, and for no other purpose whatever? Did we not hear it argued by the noble Marquess whom I see in his place, and by other noble Lords, that this property was the property of the Irish Church, and that we had no right to take 1*s*. of it from that Church? And is it not the plain fact that that vote was come to very much upon the ground so frankly avowed by a noble Friend of mine not now in his place—I mean the Earl of Hardwicke—who said he would like to see this concurrent endowment carried out—and why?—because he knew it was the only way in which he could get a "large slice" of this property for the Irish Episcopal Church; but he added that he knew nothing which was so hateful to the people of this country as the very notion of concurrent endowment. Then, my Lords, consider that the question of concurrent endowment, even to the limited extent contemplated by your Lordships, is no longer in the same position as it was before. It has now gone back to "another place," and has been rejected by the largest majority that the Ministry has ever commanded during the debates on this Bill—

Earl STANHOPE: There has been no division on the question at all.

The Duke of ARGYLL: No, but on the nearest approach to it. That makes my case all the stronger. The friends of concurrent endowment did not venture to challenge a division, and upon the question which approached nearest to it the majority was, I think, 124; so that we have the rejection by the House of Commons, fresh from the constituencies which you created and to which you appealed—we have their decided rejection of indiscriminate endowment, even to the limited extent recommended by my noble Friend. And here I must say that I do not understand the reproaches of my noble Friend who has just sat down (Earl Russell), who says—"Oh, you say nothing of concurrent endowment upon its merits, but you oppose it because the people won't have it." But did I not hear my noble Friend himself say, on the second reading, that we all knew he had been in favour of concurrent endowment, but he gave it up in deference to the opinion of the country? My noble Friend is of opinion that we did not look at the matter as philosophers, but opposed it because it was impossible. Well, I, for one, think that in politics that is very good ground to take. That is a very good reason; and I have known my noble Friend on various occasions give his vote in favour of taking a particular course simply because the thing was impossible. Then my noble Friend says—"Why put these words in the Preamble of the Bill? They are of no use." Nor would they be if not followed by enacting clauses. But this was the flag with which we went to the country, and it is right to put it in the fore-front of the Bill. It was one of the flags which we kept flying when we went to the country, and we will not haul it down—we will stand by it, because under it we have challenged the verdict of the country. Then my noble Friend objects to the declaration that it lays down an abstract principle, and that by it the Government give their assent to the voluntary principle. I entirely deny it. It is not an abstract declaration of principle—it is a practical declaration of the Government, having strict reference to this Bill and to the Irish Church. I am not a Voluntary—I do not hold the voluntary principle, though I do not, indeed, hold that servile doctrine of Establishments which has been repeatedly avowed in this House during these debates—namely, that the Christian, and, above all, the Protestant Church, cannot live in the world unless connected with an Establishment. I must say I am scandalized to see one paragraph of a Protest which has been signed by many noble Lords Members of this House, who, in the face of the Catholic world, are not ashamed, as Protestants, to say the Protestant Church in Ireland cannot compete with the organized system of the Church of Rome.

The Earl of DERBY: I beg to say there is nothing of the kind in the Protest. But what I did say was that it would be impossible to place on a footing of equality a disestablished and disendowed Church, in the position of the Church of England, by the side of a Church with all the organization and resources of the Church of Rome. I beg to say that I repeat it. You cannot place the Church of England disestablished and disendowed, upon a footing of equality with all the organization and resources which the Church of Rome possesses.

The Duke of ARGYLL: I am glad to accept that explanation. We all know what that explanation means. The Catholic world will understand it. But I should like to know why the noble and learned Lord the Leader of the Opposition (Lord Cairns) and the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough), whom I do not see present, refused to put their names to that paragraph. I should like very much to hear a good explanation of that. But I rejoice to say that there were two leading Members among noble Lords opposite who felt as I feel with regard to that declaration. Well, with respect to the Amendment before us, it is limited to this, that there should be no endowment or re-endowment of any Church. The noble and learned Lord has made a vigorous protest, with the view of inducing my noble Friend to alter the form of his Motion, to unite the negative and the affirmative with regard to this question; and I see very well the object of the noble and learned Lord. Like a party Leader and resorting to party tactics—to which as a party Leader he is perfectly entitled to resort, although the country will understand it—he strives to unite those Members of the House who hope for concurrent endowment at a future time, those who object to it, and those who wish for the postponement of the vote upon the surplus. The object is to keep open the question of indiscriminate endowments among the various sects. And here I must confess I am not at all satisfied with the appeal made to me on a former occasion when I used the same argument. I was asked whether I could conceive it possible that the noble and learned Lord would ever vote for concurrent endowment. I hope the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) is still quite satisfied—I hope he still entertains the confident belief—that noble Lords on the Bench opposite would never agree to any proposition which they had once opposed. I confess I should have hoped that the eyes of the noble Marquess and the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) near him would have been opened by the events of 1866 and 1867. I confess I do not know anything more advantageous to the country than that "Ten Minutes Bill." ["Question!"] This is strictly germane to the question. I was going to say that I hoped the noble Earl and noble Marquess had been enlightened by those previous events as to the possibility of the Leaders of the Tory party being persuaded to adopt measures under given circumstances which they had formerly opposed. Now, upon this question of concurrent endowment, I was very much struck by language used—I will not say where—but in "another place"—and I will not say by whom—but by a distinguished Member of the Tory party. I was struck with the ingenuity, the adroitness, with which he left it open to him to adopt concurrent endowment at a future time—and I believe it is his object, if ever he sees his way to it, to raise this question of indiscriminate endowment in Ireland. Not only did he leave the ground open, but remark with what adroitness he removed certain obstacles out of his way in case he should ever have to walk over it. He attacked the doctrine of the non-endowment of error, and said—"What do you mean by error? In Ireland, when there is no Established Church there will cease to be any standard of religious truth—the State knows nothing of religious truth, or error—and therefore the State will be at perfect liberty to endow all sects." According to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, henceforward where there is no Church established there is no standard of religious truth. But there is another inference and conclusion different from that to which the right hon. Gentleman would drive us, and it is this—that where the State can have no knowledge and take no cognizance of religious truth, there the State should have nothing to do with religious sects. And that is the conclusion which the people will draw with reference to religious endowments. Then there is another matter. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), though he spoke for some time with regard to this Amendment, announced the course he was about to take—I have no doubt supported by a majority of this House —with respect to other Amendments in the direction of re-endowing the disestablished Church. I wish to point out to your Lordships and the country that not only are these Amendments made with the view and purpose of keeping open indiscriminate endowment, but—more than that—of laying the foundation which must inevitably lead to that superstructure, because they are made, not merely with the view of giving the Irish Church what is its due in life interests, but of giving something over and above, in the name and for the purpose of re-endowment. Then I say, and my noble Friend (Lord Athlumney) will agree with me, and the noble Duke (the Duke of Cleveland) and other noble Lords will agree with me, that if you secure for the Established Church this large slice for the purpose of re-endowment, you must follow it up by endowing all the other religious bodies in Ireland. I say, therefore, that these Amendments are not only for the purpose of keeping open indiscriminate endowment, but of making it necessary. I confess I cannot understand the credit taken by noble Lords opposite for having consented to disestablishment, when, at the same time, they propose to present to the disestablished Church a large sum out of the funds of the State for her use when she is no longer under the control and direction of the State. Who thanks anybody for disestablishing the Irish Church if you are to re-endow it and send it forth to the country as a Free Church? I say, small thanks to noble Lords opposite if, as the price of disestablishment they secure, to a large extent, the re-endowment of the Church. I say disestablishment and disendowment are tied together by the very necessities of the case. A noble Marquess who is not present (the Marquess of Bath), who voted for the second reading of the Bill, said he never should have done so had he not hoped for a certain amount of re-endowment. Let me point out a distinction, which is perfectly fair, upon this question of endowment. Government have not only been willing, but desirous, that in the arrangement made for the commutation of the life interests of the clergy, the Church should have it in her power to secure for herself, from the manner of dealing with those life interests, a certain amount of what may be called re-endowment, and great care has been taken by my right hon. Friend to provide her facilities in that respect. The Government have been most anxious to go to the utmost limit of their tether in this direction; but we are precluded by the pledges we took before the country, and prevented by prevailing public opinion from entering upon the question of re-endowment, in as far as it brings us face to face with the insuperable difficulties of indiscriminate endowment. I have a few words to say upon another branch of the subject, and that is with reference to the general accusations expressed—I must say in the harshest language—against the Government of niggardliness, injustice, severity, and I know not what, in its dealings with the Irish Church. I say, on the contrary, that it has been treated with all the indulgence and generosity that it was possible for us to exhibit, consistent with the purpose of disestablishment. Let me put down what I conceive to be the points of the Bill in which we have shown a desire to provide for the future Church of Ireland. In the first place I will point out a distinction to which my noble Friend who addressed you last (Earl Russell) did not advert, when he said the Government were entitled to no credit for having given to the Irish Church that which was the Church's absolute property—namely, the life interests. He would not admit that there was any generosity—it was bare justice. I agree with my noble Friend that the life interests of the clergy are the absolute property of that clergy, and we have no right to take credit for giving 1*s*. of those life interests to them. But my noble Friend did not advert to something more that we have done. We have not only given the life interests, but we have secured by the enactments of this Bill the continued services of the clergy to the laity of the Church of Ireland. The Government would have been perfectly entitled to deal with the life interests of the clergy and with their life interests alone; they might have acted upon a suggestion which was made to them—and many thought they ought not to have deviated from it—they might have dealt with the clergy alone, and said—"Here are your life interests, your stipends, which are your own property." But the Government did not take that course. They dealt with the Church of Ireland, not with the clergy, and they said to the laity—"We will secure that the services of your clergy shall be continued to you for the whole term of their lives." This enactment secures to the Free Church of Ireland a whole generation of clergymen and their continued services. This is an advantage to the disestablished Church which is given to it by this Bill, and which it is possible other Bills would not have given. Another advantage secured to the Church is that the whole of the churches are secured to the new Free Church. It is all very well to say, as the Prime Minister did say, that these churches are not of marketable value; that is not true in all respects, for in some parts of the country the churches would sell for a considerable sum. If this be so, it cannot be said that the new Free Church of Ireland will go forth naked into the world. But, more than that, they are to obtain their glebe houses and gardens at almost a nominal sum. The Free Irish Church will start, therefore, with these advantages—that they will have the services of a whole generation of clergymen; that they will have all their churches built for them; that they will have their glebe houses with their curtilages and gardens for a small sum, besides the private endowments, enhanced by the vote of Parliament at least to the extent of £220,000 or £230,000. My Lords, if you were to inquire into the right of the Church to some of those private endowments before 1660 you would be sadly disappointed. I am very sorry I did not bring down to the House an extract from the correspondence between Wentworth and Laud upon this subject, which I was reading the other day; but I may describe the language used by Wentworth, in writing to Laud upon the subject of a private endowment he had secured to the Church. Wentworth says—"Oh, we have found a man who has left a considerable endowment to the Catholic Bishop of Limerick; I'll teach him who is the Catholic Bishop of Limerick" he added, and then he told how he had seized the endowment for the Established Church. Knowledge of another sum left by an unfortunate man in Brussels was obtained by Wentworth, and he sent a letter to Laud enjoining him to send to Brussels to get the money. The correspondence ends by Laud promising to mend the Catholicity of the donor. I am sure, my Lords, that a large proportion of these private endowments consists of money plundered from the Roman Catholics; but the Government has not stayed to inquire into the facts, and has granted to the Established

Church £500,000, besides the life interests of the clergy and the glebes. Besides, this the Government has provided a liberal machinery which, whatever its fault, is infinitely better than the machinery the noble Earl below the Gangway (Earl Grey) provides for the commutation of life interests. These are the advantages with which the Free Church will start, and it cannot therefore be said that it is sent forth naked into the world. I am not, as I have already said, in favour of the voluntary system in the abstract; and I say again, what I have said before, that wherever an Established Church can be maintained in unison with the feelings, and supported by the memories and affections of the great body of the people, it should be upheld, and I trust it will long be upheld in England. But, my Lords, I say that in such circumstances as those existing in Ireland, you are driven to the adoption of the voluntary principle; because, you may depend upon it it is not Mr. Miall, it is not the Liberation Society, it is the current of public opinion all over the world, which says that when existing endowments and existing Establishments fail, they that serve at the altar shall live by the altar, and by the free gifts of those who worship at the altar. Before I sit down, let me mention one fact with regard to the actions of voluntary Churches here, which may have some effect upon the hearts of those who look with hope and without perturbation to the actions of the Free Church in Ireland. Frequent allusion has been made in the course of these debates to the experience of the Free Church of Scotland, and we have been told that we cannot compare the future of the Irish Church with the success of a body which went out from the Church under the impulse of a strong enthusiasm which almost amounted to fanaticism. Admitting the force of that objection to a certain extent, and that the Irish Church will not have had experience in self-government, I refer you to another Church in Scotland which went out, not with enthusiasm—or else that enthusiasm has long since evaporated—and with no other incentive to stand their ground but that which all Churches should have —namely, faith in the rectitude of their opinions—I mean that body known as the United Presbyterians. I find that even the very weakest of their congregations—those who are so poor as to require the assistance of others—contribute on an average for the purposes of their Church £1 4*s*. 6*d*. for every member, and I find that richer congregations contribute £1 14*s*. 6*d*. for every member. Therefore I say that if the Established Church in Ireland, going out with all their churches and glebes, with great advantages in the shape of commutation of tithe, and a considerable sum in the shape of private endowments, exercise but half the self-sacrifice which is exercised by this small body in Scotland, that Church will have at the end of fourteen years—at which time the lives of the existing clergy will cease—a larger income than it has at the present moment. I entreat this House to take a more hopeful view of the future of the disestablished Church in Ireland. We have no desire to treat that body with harshness or injustice; we have desired to give it all we could give it consistently with our principles and with our pledges to the people of this country; and for my part I have perfect confidence that, before twenty years are passed, we shall see that body infinitely more powerful than it ever has been for the maintenance of Protestantism.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Duke who has just sat down (the Duke of Argyll) has made an eloquent oration, which must have impressed your Lordships; but I could not help thinking that in parts of it he was rather doubtful of his subject, and that in others he was doubtful of the enemy he was opposing. A great part of the speech appeared to me to have been originally devised as a speech upon the Motion in favour of concurrent endowment; and because the Fates did not permit of its production on that occasion, the noble Duke has not been willing that so much eloquence should be wasted. I should have been more thankful to the noble Duke if he had been a little more lucid in his explanation of the subject he was dealing with and of the enemy he was opposing, and if, before he addressed his reproaches to us, he had considered for a moment whether they were applicable or not. The noble Duke pointed to this side of the House, saying — "Concurrent endowment has been rejected by the constituencies you formed." I wish to know to whom the reproach was directed. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), who may be accused of having had something to do with the formation of the constituencies, certainly had nothing to do with the proposal for concurrent endowment; and as for us below the Gangway—speaking for my noble Friend who sits near me (Earl Grey) and myself — we may have had something to do with concurrent endowment, but we certainly had nothing to do with forming the constituencies. The noble Duke read me a severe lecture upon my simplicity in believing too implicitly the utterances of statesmen, and forgetting the possibility that statesmen might change their opinions. I am in no danger of forgetting that; if I were, I should be taught it by the fact that it is possible for a statesman who, before he came into Office, declared that disendowment and disestablishment were perfectly independent, when he sits on the Treasury Bench to declare that they are inextricably tied up together. I should be taught it by the fact that it is possible a statesman who promised the clergy of the disestablished Church their parsonage houses and some land before he came into Office, says, when he sits on the Treasury Bench, that to grant them would be absolutely inconsistent with the principles on which he got there. As to the reproach that my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns) has changed his opinion on the matter of concurrent endowment, I must venture to correct the noble Duke's view of history. Whatever may be said of my noble and learned Friend, he did not in Opposition promise anything which when in Office he denied. I have regretted very much an effort made by the Government and by those who support them — an effort which scarcely seems to me consistent with the ingenuousness which ought to prevail in our debates — to fix on my noble and learned Friend a charge of trying by some sort of conspiracy to pass concurrent endowment. There is not the slightest evidence of that in any step my noble and learned Friend has taken or in any Motion he has moved. On the contrary, his speeches abound with evidence pointing in a contrary direction. There is not the slightest evidence that he is favourable to it; but there is evidence that he is strongly hostile to concurrent endowment. It appears to me hardly fair that noble Lords should again and again attempt to fix upon the Motion which is now before the House a meaning and an intention which those who move it deliberately disclaim. The noble Duke is a very courteous man and certainly would not desire to say anything discourteous of anyone; but when my noble and learned Friend has distinctly said he is opposed to concurrent endowment and makes a Motion which has no reference to it, it does seem to me rather strong to seem to give him the lie, by saying—"You do desire it." I would say a word on behalf of those who are in favour of concurrent endowment. We believe in our cause, and we do not think it needs to skulk behind any ambiguous Amendments. We believe it to be true, and we believe that, if true, it will ultimately commend itself to the wishes and feelings of our fellow-countrymen, and we should not desire by any Parliamentary contrivance or ingeniously-framed Amendment to introduce that clandestinely which we are unable to carry openly. I repudiate, on behalf of those who have advocated that measure no less than on behalf of the noble and learned Lord who is opposed to it, the insinuation that there is anything pointing directly or indirectly at concurrent endowment in the Amendment. I may venture to say we did not need to have any such motive as concurrent endowment to induce us to oppose this Preamble. My motives in opposing it are very short and simple. I object to it because it is false and because it is foolish. I oppose it because it is false. Everyone of the objects to which the surplus is to be devoted involves the employment of some religious person. It is absurd to suppose you can have hospitals, lunatic asylums, reformatories, industrial schools, the education and maintenance of the blind, the deaf, and the dumb, and so on, without a considerable quantity of spiritual machinery. God forbid that I should object to any such result; any attempt to do it would be most irrational; but it is quite absurd to put into the Preamble of the Bill that money shall not be applied to the teaching of any religion, or the maintenance of any clergy, when it is quite clear that the objects you deliberately mark out must involve both these consequences. I further object to the Preamble because it is foolish. Nothing can be more foolish than for Parliament to pass words which can have no enacting effect—which cannot add to nor diminish from the force of the clauses that are in the Bill, and which cannot, in the slightest degree restrain the action of any future Parliament—and yet to think that they can do so. The course proposed appears to me comparable to the conduct of those who think to save themselves from drunkenness by taking the pledge. The House of Commons thoroughly mistrusts itself in the matter of concurrent endowment; its resolutions are now virtuous; but, from what has happened in the past, it thinks itself in danger at some future period; and, untaught by experience, it tries to bind its own will for the future, by the insertion of idle words in the Preamble of an Act of Parliament. It appears to me that that is an irrational course for the House of Commons and Parliament to take. If it believes that concurrent endowment is opposed to the will of the country, it ought to confide in its own resolutions. This argument seems to me sufficient for the exclusion of these words. Are there any arguments on the other side? There seems to me to be absolutely none, except that the House of Commons have passed the Preamble. Why did they pass it? Because the Prime Minister bid them. Why did he bid them? In the labyrinths of that mind I am lost. The only reasonable conjecture I can make is, that he did it in order to give this House a slap in the face. Until I hear some more reasonable ground for adhering to the words, I can have no choice but to vote with my noble and learned Friend, although I confess I do not for a moment attach any importance to the words in or out of the Preamble. We have had the whole policy of the Bill reviewed to-night. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) seemed to have taken offence at various epithets applied to the Bill pretty freely from both sides of the House: but, I confess, I have seen nothing in his explanation which seemed to me to make those epithets unjustifiable. Let us see what it is he has really given the Church. He says he has given us the services of the clergy for a certain period of time. I venture to say the liberality of that gift is very much diminished by the fact that it would not have been possible to have avoided it. Considering that the clergy, but for the provisions of this Bill, would have gone on serving the Church, the boon is a very doubtful one. The truth is, as everybody who knows anything about the subject must be aware, the gift of the services of the clergy of an Established Church to a disestablished Church is of little value. The men you want in the one case are precisely the men you do not want in the other. The clergy of the disestablished Church must be clergymen who will draw — who will get money — because the disestablished Church will have to fight against sheer starvation at every turn of its career. The clergy of the Established Church must be a different kind of men. You do not require from them the duty of getting money. What you expect from them is the profession and the teaching of a sober and restrained religion, calculated to elevate and improve the souls of men; but not calculated to drive them into that enthusiasm which too often leads to lunacy. I therefore contend that the gift of the services of those clergymen, although not wholly worthless, is a boon of such slight value as to be of little account. Then, again, we know that if the churches are to be given to us, they are not given from any peculiar good-will, and that we need not feel any peculiar gratitude for a concession which Mr. Miall himself is prepared to make. The fact is, it is found desirable to avoid in this great change any great convulsion of society, and the transfer of these churches to the Roman Catholics—and, still more, their utter desecration — would, it was well known, have raised such a storm in Ireland as would have been attended by the most disastrous results. And now for the rest of these concessions. It is difficult to remember the bundle of the small gifts which the noble Duke laid upon the table, but I believe one of them was the gift of the £500,000 for the private endowments. The noble Duke told us that their value was considerably less than £500,000. But that, apparently, is not the opinion of the Prime Minister; for at the commencement of the Session, he told us that they were worth that amount. The noble Duke went on to say that this sum was given us in lieu of the charities bestowed upon the Church prior to the year 1660. But the Prime Minister took especial care in the House of Commons to say that this gift had no reference whatever to any particular period, and that we had no right to any endowments made before that date. The truth is that the real value of the gift as stated to us by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Kimberley) was that it would save the Irish Church from litigation; but that was too good a thing to be sent back from the House of Commons unaltered, and we now find it encumbered with the condition that those who are to receive this £500,000 shall not spend it, but that they shall be bound to hold it in trust, as far as possible, for the objects for which the endowments were originally made. Now, if that is what the Government understand by saving us from litigation, I only wish that we had been left open to any danger that might arise. I can understand nothing more likely to plunge the Church in litigation than a provision which prevents them from spending this money until they have discovered that they have fulfilled trusts, many of which must necessarily be very obscure, and some undiscoverable. Beyond that there is an alteration in the clause proposed by my noble Friend behind me. I will not now defend the clause of my noble Friend. It is sufficient to say that I believe it very acceptable to the Church. But it must be borne in mind that the additional 7 per cent granted on the lives of the clergy is not to take effect unless a considerable majority in each diocese agree to the commutation. In the same way throughout the Bill wherever these little gifts occur you always find at the tail of them some niggling and haggling condition, which deprives them of all their grace and value. I am not one of those who believe that on a fair field and equally weighted the Protestant Church is not as capable as any Church of making its own way and subsisting on the contribution of its own members; but what I maintain is that in this case there is no fair field, and that they do not start on equal terms with the rival Churches in Ireland. As I have already observed, the business of the Established Church is not to draw money from its members. For 300 years they have enjoyed the possession of this money, and hitherto they have had no reason for believing that it would cease; and it was only fifteen months ago that you made that discovery. For 300 years England and Scotland believed as thoroughly as the members of the Irish Church themselves believed that the Church held its endowments by indefeasible and indeterminable title. What need, therefore, had they to accumulate wealth? We know that they have not accumulated any large amount of private endowments. We know, on the other hand, that their rivals, who have been tempted into indulgence by no such argument, have been heaping up property year after year, century after century, that they are now possessed of a vast organization which is the result of centuries of labour, and against this organization this poor disorganized disestablished Church, deprived of the prop on which for three centuries it has been accustomed to lean, will be no match at all. That seems to me to be an argument which entitles us to the justice, or, if not to the justice, at all events to the clemency of the Government. Now, my Lords, we have heard a good deal about religious equality. I cannot help asking whether you have always bound up disestablishment with disendowment. We know, on the contrary, that the policy of this country has been, as far as possible, to preserve their endowments to even the most detestable religions, and we now only ask you to extend to us the principle you have applied to the Mussulmans and Hindoos of India. I feel that the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) in saying that the Government are forbidden by the principles on which they appealed to the constituencies at the last election from giving us more than they have hitherto given, is maligning the people of this country. There was nothing in the speeches delivered at the last election to indicate the harsh, and, I must say, the vindictive provisions of this Bill. There was, on the other hand, a good deal said about kindness and liberality; but to my mind the kindness and liberality which have been exhibited towards the State Church differ very little from the kindness and the liberality with which the sheriff's officer entertains the victims that he invites to his house. I do not believe that if the Bill had passed in the state in which it was originally presented to the House of Commons more than about £600,000 or £700,000 would have been left to a Church which has been hitherto in possession of something like £20,000,000. Now, my Lords, I maintain that in the verdict of the country you cannot show any justification for such a policy. I regretted very much to hear the speech delivered this evening by the noble Earl below the Gangway (the Earl of Shaftesbury). I believe it is precisely in a case of this description—in the application of the details to great general principles—that it is the province of the House of Lords to interfere where interference is necessary, and certainly no consideration would induce me to abstain from performing that duty on this occasion. The noble Earl told us that this was the most revolutionary Bill he ever remembered, but that he was going to vote for it to avoid some evils which he said would result from its rejection. Now I confess I cannot conceive that greater evil with which we may be threatened in the future. If, on the ground that great principles are involved on which the nation has given its deliberate and sustained opinion, your Lordships are not permitted to alter the details—if you cannot decide upon the mere adjustment of private rights, upon mere questions of money—there is nothing as far as I can see upon which you will in the future be allowed to exercise an independent judgment. Do not tell me it is the verdict of the nation. I will try it by a simple test. Suppose the Prime Minister had proposed that your Amendments should be accepted, would they have been refused by the House of Commons? It is not the verdict of the nation, it is not even the verdict of the House of Commons, it is the will—the arrogant will—of a single man to which you are now called upon to submit. I have no wish to pursue any other than a conciliatory course upon this matter. If any consideration had been shown by the other side for the opinions of your Lordships, I should have been willing to act in the same spirit. No such disposition, however, has been manifested, and I believe that if you yield in this matter and allow all these Amendments to be rejected, in all future time, whenever there is a Minister with a strong majority at his back, you cannot dare to refuse your assent to even the most insignificant Bill that he sends up without being told that you are "up in a balloon" and must accept it. I feel, therefore, that if we were to follow the exhortation of the noble Earl and abandon the Amendments which, after so many sacrifices and compromises we have arrived at, we should sacrifice both the future of the Irish Church and the honour and dignity of this House.

The Bishop of LONDON and Earl GRANVILLE rose at the same time to address the House.

LORD CAIRNS: My Lords, I think the right rev. Prelate who presides over the diocese of London should be heard now. He twice before attended to address the House, but did not succeed in getting an opportunity of doing so. ("Hear, hear!")

THE BISHOP OF LONDON: My Lords, I would not have presumed to stand in the way of the noble Earl had it not been that I believe, according to the practice of your Lordships' House, no one is permitted to speak after the reply. I have not the remotest intention of detaining your Lordships by a long speech. It is true that I have not had an opportunity of expressing my sentiments during the debates on this Bill; but I know my duty towards your Lordships' House too well to discuss the principles of the Bill when it has reached such a stage as this. Feeling constrained to vote for the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord, I am anxious to briefly state my reasons for so doing. Much pains have been taken to-night to cloud the issue on which we are to vote. The noble Earl who formerly held the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Earl of Kimberley) and the noble Duke who has spoken since (the Duke of Argyll) have both endeavoured to persuade us that those who vote for the noble and learned Lord's Amendment, not only may, but must actually thereby, profess their agreement with the principle of concurrent endowment. Of course, it is perfectly natural, in the possibility of this Bill going over to another Session, that the Government should ascribe that reason for its withdrawal which they think would be most popular with the country; but I must take the liberty of saying, for my own part—and I believe for many others who sit on these Benches—that when we give our vote for the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord, we do so in no sense whatever in favour of concurrent endowment. Whatever might have been its case at the beginning of the century, I believe concurrent endowment to be now an anachronism and an impossibility. The principle on which

I give my vote is that I cannot, and I will not, record my vote for the secularization of Church property which is now attempted for the first time in our modern history. I am not prepared to argue, nor am I disposed to assert, that the secularization of Church property is sacrilege, and that there may not be rare occasions on which the application of that principle may be not only expedient, but just; but under present circumstances it appears to me to be unjust and inexpedient—unjust because you are punishing a Church against which no charge has been proved—inexpedient because you are aggravating one party without conciliating or satisfying the other. I object to it also because the Bill establishes a principle which at no great distance of time may be applied to the Church to which I myself belong, and I refuse in *nos legem sancire iniquam.*

EARL GRANVILLE: I must apologize to the right rev. Prelate for having stood up at the same time that he did. ["Order!" "Spoke!"] I throw myself entirely on the House, but I believe I have a right of reply. However, whether that be so or not, I think that, after the extensive range of this debate and the language that has been used against Her Majesty's Government, your Lordships will be inclined to strain a point in my favour. My Lords, I only ask you to bear with me for a short time. No one is less averse than myself from the production of merriment at the proper season; but I cannot imagine a more singularly inopportune moment than that which has been chosen by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) for the indulgence of such pleasure. I hardly remember any debate that I have listened to with greater interest, and I am bound to add, with greater sorrow and pain. The noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) used language towards myself and my Colleagues which, coming from any other lips—and I scarcely except his—I should have taken as offensive and utterly without foundation. He charged us with not being anxious for the success of this Bill, otherwise than putting this House in a humiliating position. My Lords, if I had any feeling of that sort I should not be grieved, as I am at this moment, at the scheme which is proposed to be carried out by those who have a large majority in this House. Nothing could give me greater pleasure than that scheme if I were actuated by such motives. My Lords, the noble Marquess thought this a not unfitting time to make a number of small points, and to excite laughter at little circumstances which occurred in the debate. From the beginning to the end of his remarks that was the course he pursued. I should have thought that if any Member of your Lordships' House filled a position of grave responsibility from the influence he exercised here on the second reading of this Bill, in deference to public opinion, and what he believed to be growing opinion, it was the noble Marquess. I am therefore the more surprised that he should have treated in a light and jeering manner the scheme proposed by the noble and learned Lord. My Lords, the noble Marpuess began by objecting to the Amendment of the Commons on the Preamble, asking if there was any reason for it?—and then he stated that, though he thought the matter perfectly immaterial, he would vote for the omission of the words, these words having been re-inserted on full reflection in the other House of Parliament by one of the largest majorities that has voted on this Bill. The proposition before the House is not only whether you will change the words of the Preamble, thus giving a perfectly different character to the scheme brought before Parliament by the Government, but whether you will go on to the retention of no fewer than four Amendments which your Lordships are recommended to insist upon. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) fairly stated to us that his object was not only to change the Preamble and the surplus clause which is protected by it, but also to retain the Amendments of the noble Marquess—and it is a curious circumstance that three of those Amendments belong either to the noble Marquess or to the noble Earl near him. With respect to the rectors and curates it is proposed to give £450,000 more to the Irish Church. Then there is the clause of the noble Earl, which professedly gave £1,000,000 or £1,100,000. It is impossible to defend these clauses. Though the noble Earl attempted to defend them, so able a lawyer as Sir Roundell Palmer stated that he was perfectly unable to answer the objections made to them. The legal Gentleman (Dr. Ball) who, in the House of Commons, has shown so much ability on this question of the Irish Church, said they were answerable; but he did not attempt to answer them. I pass on to a clause which is objectionable in itself, but is made ten times more objectionable after the debates which have taken place on concurrent endowment. I mean the clause giving the residences to the clergy free of all charge. Are these four Amendments on which your Lordships would think it wise to insist? Is the scheme now put before you one which your Lordships think calculated to prevent a collision between the two Houses of Parliament? These are questions raised by the noble Marquess which I should have been glad to answer in detail; but really I do not think this is the moment to do so. The noble Marquess objected to the imputation that this question was raised to catch votes. I am not one of those who are in the habit of imputing motives to those who differ from me; but, whether intended for that purpose or not, I certainly think, from what we have heard in the course of this debate, it is calculated to catch the votes of those who do not take a really practical view of the result of what we may do to-night. It is calculated to catch the votes of those who, like the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London), object to the whole scheme of secularization of the Church property, and it is calculated to catch the votes of those who take the same views as my noble Friend the noble Earl (Earl Russell), whose whole speech this evening was in favour of concurrent endowment; and who, in advocating it, made an extraordinary mistake as regards my argument and that of my Colleagues when he said we wanted to shut the doors against a future appropriation, because we thought that, in five or six years, the people of the country would come to be in favour of concurrent endowment; whereas, right or wrong, our argument is that we utterly dispute that such is the tendency of public opinion in this country. It is for that reason we object to leaving the question open—because we believe it will lead to interminable disputes, and to very mischievous irritation as between the different religious sects in Ireland. I promised not to trespass long on the attention of your Lordships; but I feel it would be wrong in me not to make an appeal at least to those of our Friends who generally give their support to Her Majesty's Government. I believe this is a great and just measure, and one which, looked on as a whole, is likely to be productive of much good. I therefore ask them to support us at a critical moment; and not to join in doing that which, in the words of the noble Earl opposite—words stronger than I should have liked to use—must inevitably be attended with grave and serious consequences.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR then proceeded to put the Question—

That this House do not insist on so much of the amendment made in the preamble, to which the Commons have disagreed, as consists in leaving out the words ("held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion").

THE EARL OF DERBY: The Amendments upon the Preamble should be put as one Amendment, and not as two. The House of Commons, in their Message to this House, disagrees with the "Amendment made by the Lords in the Preamble" for certain Reasons, and it is quite impossible for us to separate the Reasons of the House of Commons in order to apply some of them to one portion of the Amendment and others to the remaining portion of it.

EARL GRANVILLE: Before I made the Motion upon which the House is now about to divide, I made some inquiry as to the proper course of an authority which I have never found to be in error, and I was certainly startled by the extreme indignation with which it was received by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns), and by the way in which his objection was cheered by those around him. The first Amendment of the Commons dealt with the precise words in the Preamble which I have now moved to re-insert, and there was a subsequent Motion and division on the other part of the same Preamble; and, therefore, it appears to me perfectly impossible that there should be such a difference between the Orders of your Lordships' House and those of the House of Commons as to render the course which was perfectly regular in the latter irregular in the former. I have consulted the most eminent authorities upon the question, and I have been informed only this evening that the mode of proceeding which I have adopted is the correct one.

LORD CAIRNS: Allow me to remind your Lordships that when we sent the amended Bill down to the House of Commons they were at liberty to consider our Amendments word by word if they thought fit to do so. When, however, the Bill comes back to us our hands are tied, and we can only regard the Commons' Amendments upon our Amendments as a whole. We cannot amend our own work. The question is, do we or do we not adhere to the Amendment we have made in the Preamble? If it were otherwise, we might be asked to divide upon our Amendments sentence by sentence. This is one entire Amendment. I do not see that the question admits of any doubt.

EARL GRANVILLE: To divide upon the Amendments sentence by sentence would be utterly impossible. I have followed the course which was adopted in the other House in dividing the Amendment in the Preamble. They disagreed to the two Amendments we introduced into the Preamble, and I now ask your Lordships not to insist upon the converse principle.

THE EARL OF DERBY: The noble Earl has—if he will permit me to say so—forgotten what is the ordinary course in cases of this kind. The House of Lords sent down the Bill with Amendments, and the House of Commons has sent back the Bill with a Message to say that they disagree with our Amendment in the Preamble; and the only question before us is whether we shall or shall not insist upon our Amendments to which the House of Commons has objected. With the course adopted by the House of Commons in dealing with our Amendments we have nothing to do; we have only to consider the Message sent up by that House to us. The Reason the House of Commons assign for their disagreement with our Amendment is this—

> "Because it is right that the surplus property of the disestablished Church in Ireland should be applied for the advantage of the Irish people, and not for the purpose of re-endowing or endowing any Church in that country, and because it is proper for the final settlement of the question that the destination of the surplus should in principle be fixed and determined by the Act."

Therefore, the Reasons assigned by the House of Commons for disagreeing with our Amendment in the Preamble apply equally to both parts of that Amendment, and we have no power to separate them and to assign some of them to one part and others to the other part of the Amendment. All that we have to do is to say whether or not we insist upon our Amendment.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I can assure your Lordships that it has not been without considerable forbearance that I have refrained from presenting myself before you to-night, after the things which have been said in this House on this occasion. But I merely observe in passing upon the question immediately before the House, that the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) has produced no precedent for the course he has suggested. Had he done so, I, as one of the youngest Members of your Lordships' House, should at once have bowed to its authority; but, in the absence of such precedent, I think that we should adopt that course which is consistent with common sense, which, I say distinctly is in favour of our proceeding by the method suggested by the noble Earl (Earl Granville). ["No!" *and cheers.*] Of course I have only enunciated the proposition—but before I attempt to demonstrate it, noble Lords say "No!" ["Order!"] Common sense would teach us that there are two distinct propositions in the Preamble, one restraining the application of the surplus to religious uses, and the other contemplating the relief of unavoidable calamity. It is properly consistent with common sense that a large portion of your Lordships might be inclined to agree with one and to disagree with the other; but we are told that we are not at liberty to do this, but must accept the Amendments or disagree with them as a whole. Now, I have something of a precedent on the subject with which I have been furnished by the kindness of one of the clerks at your Lordships' table. On the Municipal Corporations Bill of 1835 there was a clause added by your Lordships to the Bill; the Commons disagreed with the whole clause; and it was ultimately agreed by your Lordships not to insist upon the said clause, but to insist on the proviso at the head of it. That was an objection, not to a Preamble containing two distinct and separate propositions, upon which anybody might conscientiously vote, white as to one and black as to the other; it was a whole clause with which the Commons disagreed. In the absence of all precedent, I do not think I am presumptuous in arguing that it is contrary to common sense to say that you cannot split into two parts an Amendment which touches two totally distinct and separate points.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The precedent which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has brought forward tells, I think, emphatically against him. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) was challenged by my noble and learned Friend behind me to state whether he was going to divide this Preamble into two parts, but he studiously refrained from giving an answer.

EARL GRANVILLE: The noble Duke is really stating what is contrary to the fact. I stated just now that the course I was about to take was exactly the converse of that which had been taken in the House of Commons.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I was not aware that the noble Earl had made that statement; but I still submit that the straightforward and proper course is to divide upon the Amendment as a whole. In order not to waste time, I do not move, as I otherwise should do, that the Clerk should read at the table the Message from the House of Commons; but, taking it as read, I say that our decision should be given upon that. And I beg to move that this House do insist on its Amendment to the Preamble.

An amendment *moved*—

To leave out from ("House") to the end of the motion and insert ("do insist on the amendment made to the preamble to which the Commons have disagreed.")—(*The Duke of Marlborough.*)

VISCOUNT EVERSLEY: I cannot agree with what has fallen from the noble Duke who has just sat down. I understood him to contend that, inasmuch as the House of Commons have included in one paragraph their disagreement to two parts of the Preamble of the Bill, in stating their Reasons against the Amendment, your Lordships' House is thereby precluded from entertaining those two different parts of the Preamble as two different subjects. Nothing is more common when one House has amended a Bill that comes up or goes down from the other House than for that House afterwards to abandon part of a clause which has been objected to, and to retain the remainder to be sent back again for approval. That is the case here; and, assuming that the noble Earl only wishes to take the sense of the House upon half the Amendment at a time, it is open to him to do so; it is only giving your Lordships the trouble of dividing twice instead of once upon the question. In point of principle, precisely the same thing as the noble Earl proposes might be done by amending the proposed Amendment, by leaving out all the words omitted by your Lordships' Amendment, and retaining only that part of the words which the House of Commons intend should be retained.

EARL GREY: I think that a great deal more time is being wasted in discussing the point than its importance demands. I admit the power of the House to deal with the question. The only question before us is whether your Lordships will adopt the proposal of the noble Earl or the Amendment of the noble Duke, which certainly appears to me to simplify matters.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I must remind the noble Earl that we have not yet debated the second part of the question, upon which I, for one, should like to be heard. ["Hear!"] If your Lordships desire that I should go on, I am prepared to do so; but it would probably be more convenient to dispose now of the first of these Amendments. ["Go on!"] I am quite prepared—nay, I am anxious to say a few words—and it is with great difficulty that I have restrained myself, at a time which is, to my mind, the most important constitutional crisis which I have ever known. I have been obliged to hear flippant jokes pass for argument; I have been obliged to sit by and hear one of the most eminent men in the country lightly spoken of—a man who has been honoured, not only by being returned to Parliament himself, but by having returned with him for the support of his views such a majority as has been unknown in the present century. And we have been told, and it is to go forth through this House to the country, that the Amendments of the House of Lords have been rejected by the House of Commons not as the result of deliberation and grave thought, but at the arrogant will of a single man. [*Loud cheers and counter cheers.*] I do not accuse any man of deciding upon any other principle than according to his conscience; but if the majority of your Lordships should think it your duty, acting according to your conscience, to reject these Amendments, you certainly will be taking a course anything but conciliatory in itself—more especially if you do so upon the ground which has been recommended for your adoption this evening, that the course taken by the House of Commons did not express the deliberate sense of that Assembly, but was a course taken under the dictation of one arrogant man. [*Cheers and counter cheers.*] I come now to the second part of the Amendment—the application of the surplus. This is a great and serious question, and I have a word to say as to the tone in which it has been treated by the same noble Marquess who told us the other day that all hollow enthusiasm had ceased on the subject of the application of the surplus. He told us on more than one occasion—nay, on three nights I noticed that in this debate he condescended to make remarks as to the proposed application for the benefit of lunatics, and he said that, after all, if he had to choose he would as soon hand over the surplus to the landlords as to the lunatics. As the noble Earl said, I can take a joke as well as any man. But there are some subjects that are not to be joked upon; and I do say that the application of funds for the relief mainly of persons infirm and lunatics is not a subject for joking. He who was the greatest master of human nature that ever lived among us, in one of his plays makes the heroine say to her lover, who is described as—

> "——A man replete with mocks,
> Full of comparisons and wounding flouts;
> Which you on all estates will execute
> That lie within the mercy of your wit."

That to wean himself of this propensity he must visit an hospital, for—

> "That's the way to choke a gibing spirit."

Let me tell your Lordships what is involved in this matter. In the workhouses of Ireland, where there ought not to be a single lunatic, there are 2,700 of these miserable beings; and that at the very same moment that you are spending large sums of money to remove 2,000 lunatics from the workhouses in London, where Parliament has decided that they ought not to stay. The Report of the Irish Lunatic Commissioners, published I believe, only this week, tells you that 6,500 more of these poor persons are at large and wholly uncared for. You are told that by this Bill you are putting money into the pockets of the landlords, who now pay these charges. The cess is not compulsory with reference to infirmaries beyond a certain fixed amount—some £300 per county. But who are the persons who pay that? There are 334,000 persons rated under £4 who pay the cess and contribute this money. These, then, are the landlords that you are going to aid. Brought up as, I have been mainly in another House, where I gained such Parliamentary experience as I possess, I have been astonished and amazed to hear statements made to-night as to everything being done by a Prime Minister, and by one arrogant man. Such statements as the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) made to-night are very similar to those he used a night or two ago, when he told us that if we were men of honour and rightmindedness we should have done so-and-so. To-night, he told us that we were not honest, that we were not in earnest about wishing to have this Bill passed, and that we had got some sinister design in wording the Preamble in the manner it has been drawn. The noble Earl was not present on the former occasion when I spoke; I hope he may be present now when I state that I do not allow the noble Earl to be the arbiter of my honour any more than I constitute myself the arbiter of his. But now, finally, let me say just one single word, and I assure you I say it with the deepest feeling—I do desire most heartily and from my soul to see this great matter settled once and for all, and in a manner which I am sure will conduce to the happiness and peace of that unhappy country, so long divided. I am anxious that we should be able to show an undivided front if assaulted, which we can hardly do at present. As an Englishman and a Churchman, I feel also that there is this danger, that among men now-a-days, as of old among the Greeks, there is a feeling that the Cross is foolishness, and, in the pride of intellect, men are despising the humility of love. I want to cherish that feeling of love, and I believe that this measure will do as much to knit into one body of Christians, united against their spiritual foes, the professors of various shades of religious opinion, as, by the affection and harmony resulting from the measure, it will enable the State to show a firm front to its external foe. But I shall be denied this gratification if, on the one hand, those who ought not to despair of the future of the Church talk as if they had no hope of its ever again holding up its head; and if, on the other hand, the subject, great and noble in itself, is treated in a spirit of levity, at the very moment when it is occasioning serious division between the two branches of the Legislature.

THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER said, he had never in the whole course of his life heard so extraordinary a speech as that of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. The Bill, instead of being a message of peace to Ireland, he regarded as a sword thrown in the face of the Protestants of that country.

EARL GREY said, the noble and learned Lord had found great fault with a statement he had made in the early part of the evening. He wished to explain that what he said was that, from the manner in which Her Majesty's Government had dealt with these Amendments, he could not infer their object was conciliation. He thought they had been comparatively indifferent to the passage of the Bill unless it was passed by way of triumph over their Lordships' House. Though willing to accept the explanation which Her Majesty's Government had given of their motives, he still thought their conduct was open to the interpretation he had put upon it.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH wished to recall their Lordships' attention to the real question before the House, and to the arguments adduced on either side with respect to it. The question was simply whether their Lordships should insist on the exclusion of certain words which they had struck out of the Preamble of the Bill as it came up from the other House. Most of the speakers on his side had stated that the words in dispute were absolutely futile, while no speaker on the opposite side had ventured to assert that the omission or retention of the words could in any way affect the object aimed at by the Bill. The great argument urged against retaining the words was that they, to a certain extent, pledged the Legislature to adopt a particular course, and that if the House adopted them, it would consent to the doctrine of the secularization of property which had been given for religious purposes. There were, however, some other questions which would be brought forward in the course of the debate. As far as he recollected, there were four Amendments besides that now under consideration, with regard to which there was a difference of opinion among noble Lords. That relating to the curates was a peculiarly valuable one, but it only affected the individual position of a certain portion of the clergy and not the interests of the Irish Church —therefore it was hardly likely to lead to any material difference of opinion between the two sides of the House. Next there was the Amendment for the commutation of life interests. As proposed by his noble Friend the commutation would give the disestablished Church about £1,000,000, whereas the counter proposal of Her Majesty's Government would give it only £420,000. Finally, there was the Amendment relating to the glebes and premises belonging to the present clergy, and this would involve a sum of between £50,000 and £90,000. The chief differences between the two sides of the House were as to the £580,000 in respect to the commutation, and the sum of from £50,000 to £90,000 involved in the Amendment giving glebe houses and lands free to the Church. He could hardly venture to give their Lordships any advice on these matters, but he had thought it right to point out to both sides what was the difference of opinion between them.

THE EARL OF WINCHILSEA, who spoke amid loud cries for a division, was understood to say that if the House was to be struck down it was not very material whether the blow was to be given by Jack Cade or any other public character. He thought that their Lordships owed it to themselves to make a determined stand upon this question. There was a time when they regarded the Roman Catholics as their greatest enemies—they need fear them no longer. They ought to fear much more the party from which another Oliver Cromwell might arise. The master of the moment was not always a wise one—Jack Cade was master of the moment at one time. There was another—yes, another person, master of the moment at present. He (the Earl of Winchilsea) would never willingly submit to arbitrary power: rather than do that he was prepared, if necessary, to lay his head upon the block, put his neck within reach of a rope, or incur the responsibilities (if he might say so in a Parliamentary sense) of a civil war; but he would not tamely give way to a dictator, no matter how completely he might be master of the situation.

On Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion? — their Lordships *divided:* — Contents 95; Not-Contents 173: Majority 78.

CONTENTS.

Hatherley, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Devonshire, D.
Norfolk, D.
Saint Albans, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Anglesey, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Normanby, M.
Townshend, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cottenham, E.
Cowper, E.
Craven, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
De La Warr, E.
Denbigh, E.
Durham, E.
Effingham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Jersey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.

Eversley, V.
Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Sydney, V.
Torrington, V.

Oxford, Bp.

Abercromby, L.
Audley, L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Camoys, L.
Carew, L.
Carrington, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clermont, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Dacre, L.
De Tabley, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Ebury, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Keane, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lurgan, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Methuen, L.
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham.*)
Monck, L. (*V. Monck.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Penzance, L.
Petre, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Romilly, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Rossie, L. (*L. Kinnaird.*)
Sandys, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sudeley, L.
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Truro, L.
Vernon, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.
York, Archp.
Dublin, Archp.

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Rutland, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Annesley, E.
Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Brownlow, E.
Cadogan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Cowley, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Ferrers, E.
Feversham, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrington, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Kellie, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lucan, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Orkney, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Russell, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Stamford and Warrington, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Strange, E. (*D. Athol.*)
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Westmoreland, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

Canterbury, V.
Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty.*)
De Vesci, V.
Doneraile, V.
Exmouth, V.
Gough, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Bangor, Bp.
Derry and Raphoe, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Hereford, Bp.
Lichfield, Bp.
London, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.
Rochester, Bp.
Tuam, &c., Bp.

Abinger, L.
Aveland, L.
Bateman, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Braybrooke, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)

Cairns, L.
Carleton, L. (*E. Shannon.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Chelmsford, L.
Churchill, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Conyers, L
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Digby, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Forester, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
Leconfield, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lytton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda.*)
Northwick, L.
O'Neill, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Ormathwaite, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Ross, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Scarsdale, L.
Sheffield, L. (*E. Sheffield.*)
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sinclair, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Templemore, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tredegar, L.
Westbury, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, after the debate which has taken place this evening, and after the declaration, just made by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, of the large majority of the Not-Contents in the division which has just been taken, I think your Lordships will see that I cannot take any further responsibility upon myself without having some opportunity of communicating with all my Colleagues. I therefore move that this debate be now adjourned.

Lord CHELMSFORD called attention to the fact that that which had now become the main Question—namely, that the House do insist on its Amendment in the Preamble—had not yet been put.

The main Question was then put and *agreed to.*

Further debate on Commons' amendments and reasons adjourned to *Thursday* next.

PREVENTION OF GAMING (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to provide for the prevention of Gaming in public Places in Scotland—Was *presented* by The Earl of MORLEY; read 1^{a}. (No. 206.)

House adjourned at a quarter past
Eleven o'clock, to Thursday
next, a quarter before
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 20th July, 1869.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — New Law Courts, Mr. Gregory *discharged,* Mr. Watkin Williams *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) *.

Ordered—First Reading—Admiralty District Registries * [229]; Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment * [227]; Militia (Ireland) * [228].

First Reading—New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment * [225].

Second Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [181].

Committee—Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * [53]—R.P.; Annuity Tax (Edinburgh) * [198]—R.P.; Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister [23]—R.P.

Committee—Report—Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland) * [87]; Dublin Freemen Commission * [189].

Considered as amended—Dublin Freemen Commission * [189]; Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2) * [212-226].

Third Reading—Dublin Freemen Commission * [189]; Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks * [199], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Life Assurance Companies * [65]; Witnesses (House of Commons) * [129].

The House met at Two of the clock.

ARMY—COURTS MARTIAL.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will, during the Recess, consider the Report of the Royal Commission on Courts Martial and Military punishments, with a view to legislation in the next Session of Parliament?

Mr. CARDWELL, in reply, said, that his right hon. Friend was aware that some of the recommendations of the Commission had already been carried into effect. One important recommendation, that of establishing a central prison, was now under his consideration in conjunction with the Home Secretary, and should he find that an estimate was necessary he would propose to submit one before Supply was closed. The subject of courts martial and military punishments had already engaged his attention, and it was his intention to consider very carefully during the Recess the recommendations of the Commission with regard to alterations in the Mutiny Act and Articles of War.

IRELAND—MILITARY PRISON AT DUBLIN.—QUESTION.

MR. KIRK said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Why no allowance appears for the medical officer of the Military Prison at Dublin, the duties appearing to be performed by any officer of the medical staff; whether Surgeon Major Tuffnell, the medical officer performing those duties, has not completed nearly twenty-seven years' military medical service, nearly all in Dublin, on the full pay of his rank; is he not the only medical officer on full pay in charge of a military prison; does he not hold Civil appointments in Dublin; and is he not also extensively engaged in private practice in that city; is there any reason affecting the interests of the service rendering it desirable that he should continue to enjoy such exceptional privileges; and, does his retention on full pay in charge of a military prison stop promotion among other medical men, and the employment of a half-pay medical officer in the prison at Dublin?

CAPTAIN VIVIAN said, in reply, that Mr. Tuffnell performed the duties of the medical officer of the military prison at Dublin, and that he had done so since 1846. He was paid as a surgeon major upon the medical staff. It was true that he had performed those duties for not twenty-seven, but twenty-eight years' completed service; but, until 1860, he was only an assistant surgeon, having foregone his promotion in order to retain his present appointment. In that year he was promoted to the rank of surgeon as a compensation for the loss of a Regius Professorship which he held in Dublin under a Royal Commission. It was also true that he was the only medical officer on full pay in charge of a military prison; but he held his appointment in virtue of his having been permanently appointed in 1846. Mr. Tuffnell was likewise surgeon to the City of Dublin Hospital, was one of the Council of Examiners of the College of Surgeons of Ireland, and had a large private practice; but there was no reason for thinking that his other duties interfered with those connected with the military prison of which he had charge. He claimed the right to retain this appointment as compensation for the loss of the Regius Professorship. It was true that his retention of this appointment did stop the employment of a half-pay medical officer to perform the duties; but it could not be said to stop promotion, inasmuch as Surgeon Major Tuffnell was upon the supernumerary list. In 1874 Surgeon Major Tuffnell would have arrived at that period of service which would enable him, if necessary, to be compulsorily retired, but until then it was not likely that he would resign the appointment.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS) BILL—[BILL 181.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. AYRTON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was now about fourteen years since that House undertook to relieve the Government and the metropolis from the great difficulties and embarrassments into which both had fallen in consequence of the policy, for a long time pursued, of declining to establish in the metropolis such municipal institutions as it had been thought necessary to form in other parts of the country. That policy no doubt originated in the old idea that the increase of the metropolis would be dangerous to the State, and that the best course was to keep it in a state of subjection, if not confusion. The result was, that at last the Government found itself unable to cope with many great questions, such as the state of the drainage and the promotion of those improvements which the changing circumstances of the metropolis rendered necessary. In order to grapple with these matters the Metropolitan Board of Works was instituted, and that body applied themselves with great ability and industry to the solution of the difficulties which pressed on their attention. In the first place, they dealt with the great question of drainage. Parliament declared that the sewage should no longer flow into the Thames. The Metropolitan Board of Works prepared a scheme in reference to that matter, and saved the metropolis from being plunged into an expenditure of £10,000,000, by reducing the plan of drainage within reasonable limits, so that the expenditure to be incurred was brought down to £3,000,000. The project, however, extended itself, and in course of time the expenditure was considerably increased. In the first place, the Metropolitan Board of Works had to grapple with the difficulty of providing funds to carry out the limited plan, estimated to cost £3,000,000, for the main drainage. The Government of the Earl of Derby took a liberal view of the matter, and came forward with a public guarantee to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to raise the necessary funds; but in carrying out that arrangement sufficient regard, perhaps, was not had to the enormous future before the Metropolitan Board of Works. The arrangement made was, consequently, of a very limited character, and the Board of Works, without attempting to found a system of finance commensurate with the future requirements of the metropolis, only thought of getting the money requisite at the moment on the best terms they could. The money was obtained on securities wholly unmarketable —namely, on bonds having such conditions attached to them that no private individuals would have thought of taking them. The Board of Works therefore had to submit to the terms which persons wishing to borrow money on unmarketable securities must be content to put up with. After the main drainage, other great works came to be considered, and the Board of Works were led by the Government to embark upon the undertaking of the Thames Embankment on the north side of the Thames. The Bill for that object was not promoted by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and, consequently, had not the advantage, in the arrangement of its provisions, of that good sense which a body like the Metropolitan Board of Works were likely to bring to the consideration of the subject. The result was that the scheme was encumbered with a number of conditions, which impaired its efficiency, and added to the expense. The estimate, which induced the House to sanction the scheme, amounted to £1,000,000, but when the duty of constructing the work devolved on the Metropolitan Board of Works, they found that it would cost, not £1,000,000, but nearly £2,000,000. They were also induced by the Government of the day to embark upon the construction of the embankment on the south side of the Thames, which they were led to believe would cost £480,000, but they found afterwards that the cost would be £900,000. The Metropolitan Board of Works undertook a number of minor improvements, such as the enlarging of streets, and inherited all the duties arising out of previous transactions. Parliament had likewise imposed upon the Board of Works the important duty of protecting the metropolis against the contingency of fire, and the Board had in consequence been obliged to incur a very considerable expense in the construction of fire-engine stations in all parts of the metropolis, and in the maintenance of an efficient fire brigade. All these operations continued to increase from year to year, and for these purposes the Board had gone on borrowing money "from hand to mouth," upon no settled system, and upon securities not generally negotiable or marketable. At length the Metropolitan Board of Works reached a stage of indebtedness of considerable amount. The funds which they had available to secure their loans had been, in the first place, a rate of 3*d.* in the pound, known as the main drainage rate. They also had at their disposal funds produced by the coal and wine duties. Besides this they had the power to levy a rate of ½*d.* in the pound for the purpose of fire engines. The amount produced by the rates had gone on increasing, in consequence of the improvement in the rateable value of the metropolis, which had reached £18,450,000; and the produce of the coal and wine duties had likewise augmented, in consequence of increased consumption. Nevertheless, the Metropolitan Board of Works found themselves embarrassed to raise the necessary funds to carry on the works, the duty of completing which had been imposed on them by Parliament. This might be ascribed to the fact that the future of the Metropolitan Board was not foreseen; and, in fact, it appeared to be in much the same kind of financial condition as the Chancellors of the Exchequer at the beginning of the last century, before the present system of finance was established, who had to go down into the City and make the best bargains they could for the money they wanted. He would state generally the position at which the metropolis had arrived by the operations he had described. After deducting what had been re-paid by the surplus of monies received out of particular funds appropriated to these debts, they had now a debt secured in various ways amounting to £7,996,256 or, in round numbers, £8,000,000 sterling. That was the debt already created, not what would enable the Board to complete the operations in which it was engaged. It had power to levy further loans to a very considerable extent; and the immediate difficulty was to obtain those loans at such a rate as the security they could give would justify them in expecting. The further loans sanctioned amounted to £760,000, For the great street between Blackfriars Bridge and the Mansion House there was the sum of £300,000; for Park Lane improvements, £135,000; for a small embankment at Chelsea, £285,000; and for the Stingo Lane improvement, £40,000, making the total he had stated. But there were also works which must be carried on, and the monies for them not sanctioned it was absolutely necessary should be raised, and Parliament must give the necessary sanction for obtaining them. The main drainage had been carried out to a very great extent, yet there was a portion necessary to connect the Embankment works with the pumping station at Abbey Mills, and there were tributary sewers it was necessary to complete to give the inhabitants generally the benefit of the enormous expense that had been incurred. The funds required to complete the system of drainage amounted to £907,000. There was also a sum requisite for permanent works, connected with the fire brigade, amounting to £50,000; and there were other minor improvements which the Metropolitan Board was engaged in, which would require £80,000; and other smaller sums, amounting to £70,000; making in all £1,107,000. Putting all these sums together they had a capital required for the purposes of the Metropolitan Board of £9,863,000. That was the sum with which they had to deal if they would place the finance of the Metropolitan Board on a solid foundation. They were now dealing with things immediately present, in fact sanctioned; but they could not but suppose the Metropolitan Board had yet a great deal to do, and therefore it was most important they should not go on with the system they had hitherto pursued, but that they should, if possible, place the financial condition of the Board on a solid basis, so that it might obtain its funds on conditions commensurate with the security at their disposal. He could not conceive why a loan properly raised by the metropolis should not, for all purposes of investment, be almost as good as one raised by Her Majesty's Government. The metropolis must stand or fall with the nation, and the credit of the metropolis must necessarily be as good as the credit of the nation, provided the metropolitan loans are not greater relatively to property and rateable value chargeable than those of the nation to the national resources. The Metropolitan Board had power to charge property rated at £17,000,000, besides an indirect taxation of £195,000. Could it be doubted, if the finances of the metropolis were properly managed, that was a security so ample and available as to enable the Metropolitan Board to raise the requisite money in the open market? The Bill on the table would effect several very important objects. In order to bolster up the present unhealthy system the Government were called upon to give the security of the State to the metropolis, which was of evil example to other towns in the kingdom. It was therefore better for the House to review what had been already done, and, if it could, retrace its steps, and say it would neither guarantee loans for the metropolis nor for any other particular section of the community. The first result would therefore be to free the National Treasury from all immediate connection with the local treasury of the metropolis. It was proposed by the Bill that all the existing loans raised by the metropolis should, with the assent of those who had advanced the money, be converted into one consolidated debt, precisely of the same character as regarded its incidents to the public creditor as the National Debt—to be treated as terminable annuities, and negotiable in the same way, the only distinction being that the one would be charged on the Consolidated Fund of the nation, the other on the consolidated fund of the metropolis. They would thus sweep away all the complications which had occurred within the last few years, and bring the existing liabilities of the metropolis to a comprehensive and solid basis. They had not only, however, to deal with the debt which already existed, but with the sum which it would be necessary for the Metropolitan Board to borrow in order to meet the immediate requirements of the metropolis. That new debt would be placed upon precisely the same footing as the other. The debt would, in fact, be extended to the amount necessary to cover the various sums he had stated, and the whole would be raised upon identically the same terms. The Bill further made provision for the raising of all future loans which might be required by the Board in the same way. The Bill would thus establish a complete system of finance which would meet the past, present, and prospective wants of the metropolis. While this was the aspect of the loan as regarded the public, it would be necessary to make provision, for the sake of the rate-payers, that the capital of the loan should be gradually reduced and ultimately extinguished. That would be done by directing that a certain sum should be paid out of the rates calculated to redeem the capital of the debt in the course of sixty years. The consolidated fund would be composed of the rates, the coal and wine duties, and all the monies which the Board would receive on capital account, from the sale of properties which might come into their hands in the course of public improvements. In case the estimate should prove insufficient, power would be given to the Treasury to direct that a further rate should be levied, so that there could be no question that the principle would be carried out. The consolidated fund would be applied first to pay the interest of the debt, and then to liquidate the capital, either by purchasing stock in the open market or by applying it in the way of a sinking fund, as might be desirable, and in that way the debt would be extinguished. The House would see that, as the conversion of the existing debt could only be effected with the consent of the creditors, no injustice would be done to them. A further provision of the Bill would be to give facilities to all persons to invest in this stock. The House had already on several occasions considered this question, and had thought it right when stocks were established of a character which might rank in estimation with the national stock that facilities should be given to trustees and others to invest in them. Parliament had, indeed, gone very much further, because it had extended the power of investing money to stocks which were not at all comparable to that which was now about to be created by this Bill, such as East India Stock and that of the Bank of England. This stock would have all the attributes of the public funds. It had been said that Parliament was now asked to give greater power to the Metropolitan Board. That was an entire misapprehension, for the Bill would diminish their powers and place a restraint upon them which was highly desirable at the present time, while it was justified by the past. When the question of the finance of the municipal bodies of the country came under consideration, it was enacted that all transactions affecting the capital funds of those bodies should be subject to the sanction of the Treasury. The present Bill would also compel the Metropolitan Board to submit an accurate statement of their obligations before contracting any further obligations. The Treasury had already given the guarantee of the public to certain loans which the Metropolitan Board had raised, and they would, therefore, take care that nothing should be done for the future to affect the security which they already possessed. This was, he hoped, a sufficient guarantee that no abuse was likely to occur under this Bill. Hon. Members might wish to know what, after all, would be the general result of the measure. It would be this—that, if they passed no Bill at all they would leave the Board to flounder on and to raise money at high rates of interest to pay for the works in which they were now engaged. There would, consequently, be a great increase of the metropolitan rates, and the amount of those rates would grow with the difficulties which the Board might have to encounter in borrowing money. Instead of that, if this Bill were carried out, not only would the present requirements of the Board be met, but the rates on the metropolis would be reduced. It was a matter of speculation at what rate of interest the metropolitan consolidated loan could be raised. He had taken it for the purpose of estimate at 3½ per cent, and if so, the result would be that to pay the interest and re-pay the capital in sixty years would require, in addition to all the other resources of the consolidated fund, an annual contribution of 2 per cent on the capital sum. That contribution, taken on the capital of, in round numbers, £10,000,000, would be £200,000; more accurately, it would be £197,000 a year for sixty years. A rate of 1*d.* in the pound on the metropolitan area produced £76,875, so that a rate of about 2½*d.* in the pound would be required to provide for these terminable annuities. The main drainage required a rate at present of 3*d.* in the pound, so that instead of increasing the rate, they would be paying off all the debt and the capital expenditure, and would at the same time diminish the rate to 2½*d.* on account of the capital account. It would then be necessary to provide for the current expenditure, which might be estimated at £120,000. That would require a rate of a little more than 1½*d.* in the pound, so that a rate of somewhat more than 4*d.* would be sufficient, if this Bill passed, to meet the requirements of the Metropolitan Board; whereas, if nothing was done, there would be a prospect of their drifting into a rate of something like 8*d.* in the pound. That was not a pleasant prospect, and the Bill would avoid the necessity of imposing so heavy a burden upon the rate-payers of the metropolis. The improvements made by the Metropolitan Board of Works in the main drainage of the metropolis were of the most permanent character, and would endure as long as the houses now built. It was, therefore, desirable and reasonable that the charge for exigencies, which had been accumulating for several centuries, and now fell upon the present generation, should be spread over a considerable term of years. If the Bill were carried into effect in its entirety, it would relieve the inhabitants of the metropolis from a great and pressing burden, and provide for the revenues which its necessities from day to day required. He moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

MR. HUNT said, it was obvious that this was a most important Bill and one which this House ought not to pass without very careful examination. It was unfortunate, therefore, that it should not have been brought on for discussion till the 20th of July, and without any financial statement, so far as he was aware, of the Metropolitan Board for this year having been laid upon the table. He was not prepared to say that the Government were in fault in not having introduced this Bill earlier; but this he would say, that before this Bill was pushed through all its stages there ought to be laid on the table a very full statement of the indebtedness of the Metropolitan Board and of the means it possessed to meet its liabilities. It was well known that for some time past the Metropolitan Board had exhausted its powers of raising money. The hon. Gentleman (the Secretary to the Treasury) said the Board had unlimited power of raising the rates, and that the property on which they could levy their impost was £17,000,000. There was no doubt that in law they had that power, but in fact they had gone to the end of their tether. If they attempted more the people would rise in arms against them; and the Board knew well that it was one thing to make a rate and another thing to collect a rate. Under these circumstances they came to the Secretary of the Treasury and asked power from Parliament to raise loans in a different manner. The hon. Gentleman said, and said truly, that the securities which the Metropolitan Board had to offer were of a kind that few people would accept. Their last securities were unmarketable. A few of them had found their way into the hands of the Bank of England; some were held by the Commissioners of the National Debt on behalf of the Savings Banks; but there were few others disposed of. It was now proposed to grant them power to create stock, and he had no doubt that if that power were given them the result would be that their securities would be more marketable. Neither did he see how on principle the House could refuse that power. They were now told that the Board wanted to increase its capital by the amount of £2,000,000, having power at present to raise £760,000. But he did not find in the Bill any limit whatever to the creation of stock, except in so far as it might be necessary to obtain the assent of the Treasury. He also understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the Treasury would have a voice with respect to the raising of fresh rates, but he did not find any such provision in the Bill. [Mr. AYRTON here pointed out a clause in the Bill.] Well, that clause was not very intelligibly worded, and he was not sure that it would suit its purpose. There were certainly one or two provisions in this Bill that he would like to see removed. One of these was that trustees might invest their trust funds in this stock, and another was that the money of the Savings Banks might be invested in it. He hoped the time might come when, as the hon. Gentleman anticipated, this metropolitan stock might be equal to the national stock; but he certainly would not at present advise trustees to invest in it. He might further observe, that if the Savings Banks were allowed to invest their funds in this stock then, in spite of the professions of the Bill, the Government would be giving a guarantee equal to the amount of the Savings Bank money so invested; for if the money were not forthcoming when wanted the Government must make it good. It was somewhat strange, too, that if the security were to be so good as the hon. Gentleman would lead the House to suppose, it was found necessary by the 36th clause to provide that, if the dividends were not paid by a certain time, a person entitled to them might go before two justices of the peace of the metropolis and have a receiver appointed. He was not, however, as he had already intimated, disposed to offer any objection to the principle of the Bill; but, seeing that it contained so many provisions, couched for the most part in very technical language, it would be well, he thought, that it should, if possible, be sifted by a small Select Committee. The adoption of such a course would, he believed, tend rather to facilitate than delay its progress through the House. The Session was now late, and much time would be occupied by an examination of the Bill in a Committee of the Whole House. He would certainly offer his most strenuous opposition to the two clauses which allowed of the investment of trust funds and the money of Savings Banks in the stock. He presumed that the Bill would not empower the Metropolitan Board to raise money, even with the assent of the Treasury, for the purpose of carrying out any works the expediency of constructing which was not in the first instance submitted to Parliament. If there was not a provision of that kind already in the Bill, it was absolutely necessary that it should be introduced.

Mr. LOCKE said, he thought the suggestion of his right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Hunt) ought to be adopted. The metropolis generally knew nothing whatever of the Bill. It appeared to him that there was no limit to the power of rating in this Bill, and no limit to any course the Metropolitan Board might adopt, except that they must obtain the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury. But, as the Government refused to be answerable in any way for the money that was to be raised, the Secretary of the Treasury would have no deep interest in keeping a watch over the proceedings of the Board. He had heard nothing of the rate of interest at which the Board proposed to borrow the money, or in what way they intended to borrow it. The City for many years past had raised their loans on bonds which were always transferable, and this plan had been found to work extremely well. If the fund now raised by the Board were to be the only sum applicable to paying the interest of the stock, he could not see how this Bill would place them in a better position than that in which they now stood. They had now come to a stand-still, and could levy no further rate, and the question was whether hereafter they could increase the amount of the rate. There were difficulties in almost every clause of the Bill, and he thought the rate-payers ought to have a full opportunity of expressing their opinion with respect to it. He trusted the suggestion which had been thrown out by the right hon. Gentleman opposite would be adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he did not wish to offer any opposition to the second reading, though he thought the Bill would require amendment. The principal object of the Bill was said to be to enable the Metropolitan Board to obtain advances of money more readily and at a lower rate of interest without any guarantee from the Treasury, and to release the Government guarantee. To that there could be no objection, but there were many parts of the Bill which required serious consideration, and he therefore approved of the proposition for referring the measure to a Select Committee, by which improvements might be introduced more effectually than in the House. His hon. Friend (Mr. Ayrton) had spoken of the unfavourable terms on which money had been raised by the Metropolitan Board; but he did not agree with his hon. Friend on this point. The greater portion had been raised under the sanction of the Treasury at 3¾ per cent, and the remainder, but not a large portion, at 4 per cent. He did not consider that a high rate of interest. The money which was not covered by the guarantee had been raised at 4½ per cent, and this also was a fair market rate for the money. No doubt if the Secretary to the Treasury by consolidating the debt could make it more marketable, and could open the investment to the community at large, he would be doing a great public service. But the success of the scheme must depend on the present holders of bonds. Some were payable in 1882, and others in 1888; the payment of the interest was secured by the Act of last year; £185,000 a year was set aside for the payment of interest to the bondholders and the redemption of the money until 1882. Whether the holders of these bonds would be content to exchange that security for a security not guaranteed by the Government he was unable to say; but so far as the success of the proposition depended upon their assent, it must not be assumed by anyone that the security offered under this Bill was a security which the present creditors would accept in exchange. He regretted that the House was not in possession of any detailed statement of the liabilities of the Metropolitan Board, or of its available resources. The whole of the debts of the Board, including £2,000,000 which they now required, would amount to £10,000,000. There was a sinking fund, to which £200,000 were appropriated. The interest, payable at 3½ per cent, amounted to £350,000, making together £550,000. There was a deduction of £195,000 on account of the coal and wine duties. With regard to the Bill itself there was no limitation as to the securities in which the money was to be invested. He thought that and some other points were fair matters of consideration by a Select Committee. He did not, however, regard with great jealousy the power proposed to be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works, for he did not conceive that that Board could enter on works with the consent of the Treasury alone, but they would also need the authority of Parliament for the purpose.

Sir WILLIAM TITE said, the Bill was brought forward entirely in the interest of the rate-payers. Up to a certain point the loans had been guaranteed by the Government, but last year an intimation was given that the guarantees had gone far enough. The Metropolitan Board had endeavoured to borrow money for the purpose of continuing the Embankment up to Battersea Bridge. They advertised for a loan and received offers at 4¼ per cent, but the parties were unable to carry out their offers. They eventually succeeded in effecting a loan in small sums at 4½ per cent to the extent of £150,000. Considering the great improvements which the Metropolitan Board were called on to carry out, he thought that when the Board were placed in this difficulty Parliament ought to do something to assist them.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, that many rate-payers regarded the provisions of the present Bill with jealousy. The reason why the Metropolitan Board were unable to raise money was that they did not command the confidence of the public, either with regard to their expenditure, or their mode of rating. Under all former Acts to enable that Board to raise money a limit had been fixed as to rating, but now it was proposed to consolidate the different Acts and omit the limitation. The power of unlimited rating ought not to be allowed. The check of the Treasury might be sufficient as regarded national expenditure, but he doubted if it would be sufficient in the case of a comparatively small community. The Bill had been framed regardless of that distinction, and also of a rule which ought not to have been overlooked. One of the recommendations of a Select Committee, over which the Secretary for the Treasury presided, was that in all future contracts for money the owners and occupiers should be rateably taxed. He wished to know why that principle had not been imported into the present Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was glad to find that the general feeling of the House was in favour of the second reading of this Bill. He thought its general principle must be admitted to be beneficial. It would enable the Metropolitan Board to borrow with greater facility, by putting the loan in the most available form, and make the best terms with the lender. It also relieved the Government from guaranteeing the loans of the Metropolitan Board, and although he did not think there was any risk in that guarantee, it certainly formed a bad precedent which might be liable to inconvenience if it were not put an end to. So far as it had any effect it would enable the Metropolitan Board to borrow on easier terms than they now did, and so far it would relieve the rate-payers. As to limitations, the Bill was limited to such a sum as, together with the revenues derived from different resources, would enable the Metropolitan Board to pay interest on £10,000,000, and to provide a sinking fund to pay off the whole in sixty years. If they attempted to limit the rates, that would, of course, interfere with the security, and so far increase the charge to the rate-payer. All this seemed to him, and he hoped to the House, very reasonable; but the proposal made by his hon. Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke), the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt), and others was also reasonable — namely, that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. The Bill was technical in its language, the subject was intricate, and the state of Public Business had not enabled them to lay it before the House till the present advanced period of the Session. It might therefore be well to refer the Bill to the consideration of a Select Committee. The security of the metropolis, limited as it was in amount by this Bill, was continually increasing by the mere increase of building. It was a very good security, and he saw no objection to allow trustees to invest their funds in it. But he thought it a perfectly reasonable request that the matter should be looked into. It should therefore be referred to a Select Committee of seven Members, and his hon. Friend (the Secretary of the Treasury) would give notice of their names, so as to lose as little time as possible in proceeding with it.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he was glad that the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would refer the Bill to a Select Committee, as many of its provisions required attentive consideration. It had been said that the Bill was limited to a sum of £10,000,000, but that did not appear on the face of the measure. The hon. Member for Bath (Sir William Tite) was in error when he stated that up to a certain time Treasury guarantees had been the rule with the Metropolitan Board. The powers of the Board were contained in statutes, and it was only when the Thames Embankment came before Parliament that any question of a Treasury guarantee arose, and a guarantee was then given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was now the First Minister of the Crown. So far as he knew that was the only Treasury guarantee which had been given. The present Bill proposed to take that guarantee away, and in that case what would be the inducements which the public would have to subscribe to a new loan? There were two—one that the period of re-payment would be extended, and the other that the stocks would be consolidated. He should offer no opposition to the second reading of the Bill, but he objected to the assumption contained in the clauses that the measure would be a great success. It was assumed that the stocks created would be admirable investments, and that they must command the confidence of the public, and therefore it was provided that trustees should invest trust money in them. It would be time enough for that, however, when the stock had been before the world some time, and when it had really earned the confidence of the public. The investment suggested under the 9th clause was open to great objection, as it seemed to him to be an indirect interference by the Treasury with the Metropolitan Board of Works, which would give a moral if not an actual guarantee to investors, and the same objection applied to the provision under which the Commissioners of the National Debt were authorized to lend their money. He thought if the actual guarantee of the Treasury were withdrawn it would be better to let the stock find its own way in the market, and commend itself on its merits to the confidence of the public.

Mr. JESSEL said, he entirely agreed with the general object of the Bill, but he must protest against the 8th clause, which proposed to authorize trustees to lend trust money to the Metropolitan Board of Works, upon the securities offered by the Bill. The effect of that would be to authorize trustees to lend trust money on a security on which they were not authorized to lend by their trust, or, in other words, it would allow a man's contract to be altered without his consent. The trustees would thus be empowered to commit what would otherwise be a breach of trust, simply because the framers of this Bill thought it might be beneficial. No doubt there were precedents for such a course, but they were very bad ones. He thought that the policy of the Act passed at the instance of Lord St. Leonards, which empowered trustees to invest funds in Bank of England and East India Stock was highly objectionable; but that Act, at all events, dealt with stocks which had been long created and with the market value of which Parliament was well acquainted. But the present Bill proposed to allow trustees to invest in stock of which nothing was at present known, and the very nature and conditions of which had yet to be settled between the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Treasury. They were told that there would be ample security provided for the invester, but on examination that security turned out to be of a very illusory character. By the 36th clause provision was made for the appointment of a receiver, and he was to be appointed by two metropolitan justices, on the application of a creditor of £1,000, to look after £17,000,000. But that receiver was to have no salary, to give no security, and if there were any defalcations under his management, the loss was to fall on the person or persons who had applied to have the receiver appointed. Anything so absurd as these provisions he had never seen. It was an insult to a man's common sense to call that a security for anything. He hoped when the Bill went before a Select Committee reasonable provision would be made for the appointment of a receiver by the Court of Chancery under the usual regulations made in such cases. The 43rd clause provided that the Metropolitan Board might create terminable annuities. Looking at the 8th section, he did not find that it imposed on the investments which might be made by trustees under its operation any of those limitations as to the consents to be obtained which existed in the case of other investments of trust funds, and the result would be that trustees might invest their money in annuities which would give over to the tenant for life the whole of the property. He hoped the House would pause before it proceeded any further in a career which, if persevered in, would, he believed, end in disaster to the owners of settled property.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, it seemed to him that the Bill endeavoured to accomplish, in a very roundabout way, what might be effected in a direct manner. In his opinion, if they wished to assist the metropolis to clear off its debt, the best and the easiest mode to attain that end would be to give a Parliamentary guarantee; and considering the magnitude of the metropolitan property, he did not think that any danger or inconvenience could arise from such an operation. Unless the stock which it was proposed by the Bill to create were made thoroughly marketable by means of a Parliamentary guarantee, it would utterly fail in securing the object which it was intended to promote. Instead of being a security scarcely less substantial than Consols, it would be brought into competition with the various secondary securities, such as the new East India Railway Stock, in whose case a comparatively high rate of interest had to be paid, and the metropolis would not be benefited by being enabled to raise loans at a low rate of interest, to the extent which the Government seemed to expect.

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE said, he was of opinion that the speech in which the Bill had been introduced to the notice of the House by the Secretary to the Treasury was even more alarming than the Bill itself, involving as it did the question whether the principle of funding debt—that last resource of persons in difficulties—was to be brought to bear in every case of local expenditure throughout the country. It was incumbent on the House to see that by a Bill of this kind the rate-payers in the metropolis were not saddled with an expenditure towards which they could not fairly be called on to contribute. There was to be a transfer office and a sinking fund; the Board were to have power to create terminable annuities and buy stock. It would be a copy on a small scale of the Imperial Treasury, and a Chancellor of the Exchequer would be necessary in the Metropolitan Board to explain these complicated financial arrangements. The Secretary of State for the Home Department had stated that he hoped, in the year after next, to introduce a measure for the general government of the metropolis. That being so, was this a time for the creation of this amount of consolidated stock merely for the sake of raising the £750,000, which, according to the Secretary to the Treasury, was the immediate want? The Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to have been bribed into acquiescence by the prospect of getting rid of the Government guarantee; and that was the reason he had supported the Bill. In his (Mr. Alderman Lawrence's) opinion, however, the measure was, in every point of view, crude and unsatisfactory, and he was glad that it was to be referred to a Select Committee. He must express his surprise that such a measure should be brought in at so late a period of the Session.

Colonel SYKES said the Bill would be at least productive of this advantage—that it would create, in the person of the Secretary to the Treasury, an officer who would answer in that House for the Metropolitan Board of Works; and as the right hon. Gentleman himself held a responsible position, some sort of connection would thus be established between Parliament and that Board. Hitherto he (Colonel Sykes) could never get any Government official to answer for the acts of the Metropolitan Board of Works. He was of opinion that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, in order that it might be thoroughly examined before any legislation was based upon it. So far as he could see, its effect would be to lay an increased burden of 2 per cent upon the rate-payers, with the view of paying off the capital sum. Already, in order to insure the payment of the debts of the Metropolitan Board, the poor had to pay an enhanced price for their coals, and therefore had a just right to complain. At any rate, this House should exercise a direct control over the works undertaken by the Board.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he did not object to the Bill being referred to a Select Committee; but he thought that the House was somewhat hasty in expressing agreement with its principle. He thought that a more inopportune moment could not have been selected for introducing so important a scheme than the present moment; and that not simply because the Session was wearing towards its close, but because Parliament was on the eve of entering upon reformed legislation to meet the requirements of metropolitan government. He thought it would have been wiser to have delayed this Bill, for its only effect would be to fix more firmly than ever round the neck of the people of London the huge millstone of the Metropolitan Board of Works. He believed the rate-payers would rather see that Board entirely dissolved.

Dr. BREWER said, the Metropolitan Board of Works had been originally called into existence by Parliament to supersede the Commissioners of Sewers. As time passed on, fresh works and responsibilities were thrust upon the Board without the necessary funds being given to it to carry out the schemes, and the consequence was that the Board now came before Parliament asking for facilities to relieve itself of a responsibility of £10,000,000. He maintained that Parliament having put the Board into this awkward position, was bound to do all in its power to extricate it from the dilemma.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he could not admit that Parliament should be held responsible for the position in which the Metropolitan Board was placed. The Bill was a remarkable comment on the proceedings of the Metropolitan Board of Works, for it appeared that while that Board had an unlimited power to tax occupiers, they could not, however, make any further addition to the taxation, on account of the inability of the rate-payers to bear the burden. He had little faith in the moderation of the Board; and it by no means followed that, because they were enabled to borrow money on easier terms, the rate-payers would derive any benefit from that fact. Of course, investments by trustees would only be made with the requisite consents under trust deeds and settlements, and to that he did not see any objection. He hoped the Bill would be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he hoped the Government would give time to enable the rate-payers of the metropolis to state their case fully. The rates were increasing year by year, and every consideration should be paid to the wants, grievances, and even feelings of the tax-payers.

Mr. SAMUDA said, he thought the purposes to which the money proposed to be raised was to be applied should be clearly specified before the Bill was passed, and that if this were done the provisions of the measure would not be objected to. For instance, it might at some future time be found necessary to carry the main drainage works out to sea, and a very largely increased expenditure would be required for this purpose. It would be well, therefore, to fix beforehand the amount which the Bill was intended to cover, so that if any further sum should be required a fresh application to Parliament should be made for that purpose.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

And, on July 21, Committee *nominated* as follows:—Mr. AYRTON, Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, Mr. SMITH, Mr. M'LAREN, Mr. CROSS, and Mr. CHAMBERS:—Three to be the quorum.

PRISONS (RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION).

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. MAGUIRE rose to call attention to the inadequate provision made for the religious teaching of Catholic Prisoners in the Metropolitan Prisons. There was a large and poor Catholic population in London, who were very liable to the temptations which poverty brought with it. Under these circumstances, it was natural that a considerable number of them should be found in the London prisons. At present, in the four to which he should refer, there were between 600 and 700 daily, and the religious provision made for them was a cause of great scandal. The Government had appointed Catholic chaplains in the Government prisons, with the best results; and, five years since, an Act was passed, giving to the prison authorities the power of appointing a sufficient number of Catholic chaplains, and of paying them out of the rates. Unfortunately, the Act was permissive, and he was sorry to say that it had only been put into execution in rare instances. It was long before the Middlesex magistrates allowed a Catholic chaplain to enter the walls; but, at length, in this and in other metropolitan gaols there was some improvement, but the restrictions on the visits of the priest were still very great; and while the Protestant chaplains, according to the Returns, got £2,010 a year—if all the assistance given was included, £3,000 would be nearer the mark—not one farthing was given to the Catholic priests.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present—

MR. MAGUIRE resumed. He did not object to the pay given to the Protestant ministers; but it was an intensely shabby thing on the part of the visiting justices to receive the services of the Catholic clergymen without giving them a single farthing. In some cases, it was known that Catholic prisoners registered themselves as Protestants, on entering these gaols, in the hope of getting better treatment. At Tothill-fields Prison, for instance, where there were 600 prisoners, only 200 professed to be Catholics, although the fact was that 300 prisoners were of that faith. The remaining 100 denied their religion in the hope of getting various advantages. It was asserted that the Roman Catholics were excluded from those parts of the prison in which the work was supposed to be most agreeable — the laundry and the kitchen. But this hypocrisy made them worse than they were when they entered the gaol. In every prison in Ireland, there was both a Protestant and a Catholic chaplain, and he wanted to see the same system established in the English prisons; for if religion was not an utter sham, the influence of the clergyman must be a powerful deterrent of crime, and the present system tended to keep up the standard of crime. Only last Tuesday, the Middlesex magistrates decided on building a new prison at a cost of £100,000. That was owing to the increase of crime; and he held them responsible, to a large extent, for that increase, because they did not take the proper means of eradicating crime, by means of one of the most powerful agencies known to society. He would now mention some of the restrictions imposed by the justices on the ministrations of the Catholic priests. In Coldbath-fields, although there were 329 Catholic males in the prison, the priest was allowed to visit it only three times a week, from nine till half-past twelve, and was only allowed to give one service on Sundays. An afternoon service was permitted to Protestants, but not to Catholics. The Catholic priest applied for leave to give instruction in the elementary truths of Christianity every Sunday afternoon;

but the answer was, that the arrangements of the prison prevented the magistrates from acceding to the request; so that this clergyman, who did not receive a farthing for his ministrations, but in his zeal desired to teach these ignorant prisoners, was not allowed to prosecute a design so beneficial to them. At the House of Detention, Clerkenwell, where there were seventy-five Catholic prisoners, the priest was allowed to see the male prisoners once a week on the Friday, and the female prisoners once a week on the Wednesday, but no service was permitted on Sundays. At Tothill-fields Prison the Catholic clergyman asked to be allowed to appoint a Bible reader, but the request was refused. Then he asked for leave to appoint a religious teacher, but was refused. A third time he begged to be allowed to appoint a Bible reader: the answer was—"There is no such teacher for the Protestants;" but when they were pushed, the authorities admitted that there was a Protestant reader of Scripture. Could anything be so mean and shabby as that wretched evasion? The grievances common to all those prisons was that no pay was allowed to the visiting Catholic priest, and the Catholic prisoners had no teachers of their own creed, and no Scripture readers. No Catholic extern was allowed to pay a charitable visit to the Catholic prisoners, though many of the Middlesex magistrates allowed their own daughters to enter the prisons for the purpose of reforming the Protestant prisoners; and there were no means afforded to Catholic clergymen for seeing the most depraved Catholic prisoners. Another instance of intense shabbiness was, that in one prison a Catholic clergyman attended 129 prisoners, and another Catholic clergyman in another prison attended 200 prisoners, and everything necessary for the celebration of Divine worship they had to pay for out of their own pockets. Early last year, when he brought this subject forward, the present Government were not in Office, but the late Home Secretary recommended another year's trial, should be allowed the magistrates. They had had that other year's trial, and their conduct continued as bigoted and as shabby as ever. He had great faith in the present Home Secretary's sense of justice, and he would ask him whether any evil had resulted from the ministrations of Catholic clergy in the Government prisons? As it was too late for legislation on the subject in the present year, he was willing to give the Middlesex magistrates another year's trial; but he wished to know whether the Government, if those magistrates did not alter their conduct, would next year introduce a Bill to compel them to do so. He did not condemn all the visiting justices, for there was a noble minority who were endeavouring to bring about a reform in the present most unsatisfactory system. He concluded by moving an Address for Returns on the subject.

MR. BLAKE, in seconding the Motion, said, that though in the South of Ireland the great majority of the population was Roman Catholic, yet it was a compulsory provision that there should be Protestant clergymen in the prisons. He was enabled to state that the amount of the salary paid to the Protestant chaplains, though they had little or nothing to do, was as much, or nearly as much, as the amount paid to the Roman Catholic chaplains. He had the curiosity to inquire into the salaries received by the Catholic and Protestant chaplains, and he found that there was very little difference between them. There were a great many Catholic prisoners in some of the metropolitan prisons, and the system pursued with reference to religious instruction was such as to make them much worse men when they came out than when they went into prison. He knew that some of his poor Roman Catholic countrymen, for the sake of getting more lenient treatment, and for the very sensation of attending Divine worship, had been induced to enter themselves as Protestants; no provision being made for their religious instruction, except on terms which were calculated to make them hypocrites. He heartily joined his hon. Friend (Mr. Maguire) in the hope that the Home Secretary would make some distinct statement on this most important subject, which might strongly influence the justices to pursue a more impartial course.

Moved for—

Address for "Returns of the County and Borough Prisons of England in which Religious Instruction is afforded to Prisoners of different Denominations, specifying which and at what cost to each:

"And, of the number of Prisoners in each Prison, and to what Denomination they belong;

the Returns to be made up to the 20th day of July 1869, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 284, of Session 1867-8."—(*Mr. Maguire.*)

MR. CANDLISH said, he felt that his hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) had made out a case of injustice; but there was another mode of curing the wrong than that which had been indicated. So strong was his feeling and conviction in favour of voluntary action that he was persuaded the withdrawal of every paid chaplain in every prison would leave the inmates in a better condition spiritually than they were at this moment. Workhouses, where there was no paid chaplain, were amply provided for by the voluntary efforts of the various religious denominations. His belief in the vitality of Christian truth and principle was such that Christian men and women would be found exerting their agency in whatever direction humanity most called for it.

MR. BRUCE said, he was not at all surprised that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) had brought this subject under the consideration of the House. When his right hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth (Sir George Grey), as Home Secretary, brought in the Prison Ministers Bill in 1853, which enabled every local authority to employ and pay the services of ministers of religion in the gaols, it was certainly his expectation that in all important populations of the country effect would have been given to the provisions of the Act; but he was bound to say that his expectations had been considerably disappointed. In Lancashire and some other parts of England the principles of justice had been acted upon. At Liverpool chaplains were employed with the greatest advantage in ministering to the large number of Catholic prisoners; and in most towns in the North and North-west of England, where there was a considerable Roman Catholic population, Roman Catholic chaplains had been appointed to the gaols. He had been asked if in the Government prisons any difficulty had arisen from the want of harmonious cooperation of chaplains of different religious opinions; no such difficulty, no inconvenience worthy of notice had been experienced. It was impossible to deny that his hon. Friend had serious cause of complaint. From the nature of the duties required from prison chaplains he thought they could not be efficiently performed by voluntary agency. They demanded continuous labour, especially in the great gaols, where the prisoners were numbered by hundreds, almost by thousands, and it could hardly be expected that the poor Roman Catholics of the large towns, having difficulty enough to maintain their own clergymen, could also provide a Catholic chaplain for the gaol. He agreed that it was most important that the unfortunate prisoners should have the comforts and advantages of regular religious aid from chaplains belonging to their own communion. This was quite as important in the case of short as long sentences; for it was of the utmost moment that a prisoner in leaving the gaol should have some one interested in looking after his welfare, and seeing that he was put in the way of leading an honest life. And, in the case of Roman Catholic prisoners, who so likely to do this as the priest? This was the more necessary from the forlorn condition of many Irishmen in this country. As a matter of fact, Irishmen in Ireland were as free from crime as Englishmen in England—indeed more free, both as regarded the number and gravity of crimes. But the case was reversed with Irishmen in England, and this was attributable not to their race or condition, but simply to the force of circumstances. He had lately been looking into this subject for other objects, and he found that while the Welsh population, forming 6 per cent probably of that of England, under most favourable circumstances as to crime, committed only 3 per cent of the crime in England, the native born Irish, amounting to but 3 per cent of the population, committed 14 per cent of the crime of England. They were almost inevitably thrown into the worst localities, and had to associate with the worst characters. Who was there to take an interest in these men when convicted of crimes? Only one person, and that was the priest. He (Mr. Bruce) therefore listened, not only without sympathy but occasionally with indignation to the complaints sometimes made about the increase in the number of Roman Catholic priests and of Roman Catholic establishments in this country. Considering the vast numbers of the Irish population, they had not near priests enough. What was the remedy? The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake) had told them of

Protestant chaplains of gaols in Ireland who were paid at the same rate as the Roman Catholic chaplains, although there might be only one prisoner to attend to. That state of things would hardly be borne in this country, and it was to guard against such an occurrence that the Prison Ministers Act had been made permissive. The Legislature assumed that where there was a considerable number of Roman Catholic prisoners the authorities would appoint and pay a Roman Catholic chaplain. In seventeen prisons this want had been supplied, and he knew of no instance in which there had been so great a disregard of justice as in the metropolitan district. He was afraid some partiality had been shown in allowing lady visitors to enter the prisons, but he did not think there had been any attempt to conceal the religion of the prisoners, or to make converts. He believed that those magistrates who had refused to pay Roman Catholic chaplains had offered no objection to the visits of Roman Catholic priests. Justice, however, required that they should be employed and paid wherever there was a considerable number of prisoners. He could not say that he was prepared with a remedy. He admitted the evil and the injustice, but the difficulty, which had been equally felt by his predecessors, would remain, and, unless Parliament was prepared to lodge in the hands of a Minister of State, the power to over-ride the decision of the magistrate there were no means of remedying the grievance. Something must be left to the judgment and discretion of the local authorities; but the only way of dealing with some of the cases referred to was to invest the Secretary of State with a power which, he believed, might safely be lodged in his hands. The matter should have the serious consideration of the Government during the Recess.

Colonel AMCOTTS said, he believed the remedy was much more in public opinion than in the action of the Government, and he trusted that the public would insist on the appointment of paid Roman Catholic chaplains to minister to the wants of the Roman Catholic prisoners. It was difficult for the present or for any Government to act with a high hand in this matter, but the day would come when public opinion would insist upon religious equality herein.

Mr. Bruce

Mr. MAGUIRE begged to express his gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and his willingness to leave the matter in his hands.

Motion *agreed to.*

IRELAND—RECENT EVENTS IN ULSTER.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON, in rising, pursuant to notice, to call the attention of the House to recent events in Ulster, bore testimony to the courtesy with which the various questions affecting that province had been dealt with by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. A large force of military and constabulary had no doubt been sent to that part of the country on the occasion of the great anniversaries which had been held there at the commencement of the present month; but then he had no complaint to make against the Government on that score, because he was bound in fairness to admit that, in taking those steps for the preservation of peace, they were simply following the precedents which had been set them by their predecessors in Office. He must at the same time complain of the action of the constabulary in several parts of the North of Ireland, while he had no desire to prejudge the investigations which were now being instituted into their conduct both at Derry and Portadown. The conduct of the Roman Catholic population of Ulster on the occasion of the recent anniversaries was such as to entitle them to the thanks of those from whom they differed in politics and religion; but he believed that the presence of the constabulary frequently did more harm than good. In one instance when he was asked what could be done to preserve the peace, his answer was—"Keep the police out of sight and there will be no disturbance." The advice was taken, and the result justified the opinion. He had been requested by Mr. Watson, the father of the young man who had been shot by the constabulary at Portadown, to urge upon the Government the necessity of an early, searching, and impartial inquiry into their conduct on that occasion. On one occasion, when a flag had been placed on a church in the county of Down, exciting no feeling of hostility in the Roman Catholics in the neighbourhood, the stipendiary magistrate and the police had ordered the flag to be taken away to prevent disturbance. That order was not obeyed, as there was no law to prevent the flag being exhibited, and no danger was apprehended from the Roman Catholic population. When, however, the Orangemen heard that the flag was about to be pulled down, great difficulty was experienced in preventing a collision between them and the police, and he hoped therefore the Government would take steps which would prevent the constabulary in future from pursuing a course which might lead to a breach of the peace. There was another point to which he wished also to call attention. It was stated that, since the occurrences at Derry, a subscription list had been opened in connection with the pending inquiry at all the constabulary barracks throughout Ireland, under the sanction of the Inspector General, and that those members of the force who had not put down their names as subscribers were duly registered in its black books. The feeling of the Protestants of Ulster was, he need scarcely add, entirely opposed to the ecclesiastical policy of the Government; but it was opposed also to the one-sided Party Processions Act, and he hoped the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be able to announce that he would introduce a Bill on the subject next Session which would meet their reasonable views. At four meetings which had been held on the 12th inst., and which were attended by no less than 150,000 persons, the following resolution had been passed:—

> "That, disclaiming any intention of annoying or intimidating any class or creed of Her Majesty's subjects, and according to others the utmost freedom in the expression of their religious and political sympathies, we desire to assert for the Protestants and Orangemen of Ulster their constitutional right publicly to manifest their attachment to those principles which they hold dear; and therefore declare the 'Party Processions Act' to be impolitic, ungenerous, and unjust, and demand its immediate repeal, in the name of justice and liberty."

The *Ulster Examiner*, which was reputed to be the representative of Bishop Dorrian, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor, of the 13th of July, had, he might add, made the following statement in a leading article:—

> "It cannot be denied that the lodges had a field-day yesterday; but we do not object to this. Their right to assemble in their 'tens of thousands,' or in their hundreds of thousands, for any legitimate purpose is undisputed, and had they in years past avoided outrage and insult to their Catholic fellow-citizens, no Irish voice would have been raised in opposition to their displays."

The reporter of the same journal, in describing the meeting at Killyman, said—

> "The Bangor procession for which Mr. Johnston was prosecuted and convicted sinks in the shade when compared to it, and certainly a more 'effective' demonstration I could not conceive or imagine. Words would fail to describe the appearance of the field. It is most variegated, and the beautiful dresses of the Orangewomen of Tyrone, and the colours worn by their partners, together with the crimson and purple that everywhere prevail, form a pleasing contrast on the green hill side."

How was it possible, then, that the Government should legislate against such demonstrations as calculated to lead to a breach of the peace? It would be impossible to prosecute a whole province, or imprison 250,000 people. The Party Processions Act, it was quite clear, was ineffectual to prevent the meetings against which it was directed; and, seeing that its provisions could not be carried out, and that it was calculated to do more mischief than it was likely to prevent, it ought, he contended, to be repealed. But it was not only such Acts as the Party Processions Act which were violated. The right rev. Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, had, on the 19th of July, 1867, when examined before the Select Committee on the Ecclesiastical Tithes Bill, stated that—

> "The enactment had been totally inoperative, and that he had held it to be unlawful and void," adding—"My practice ever since I became a Bishop has been to use my title, and I do so because I think it is a right and proper thing to resist authority, whether spiritual or temporal, when it goes beyond its just limits."

The hon. Member concluded by moving—

> "That there be laid before this House, Copies of Reports of the Stipendiary Magistrates relating to the state of Ulster on the 12th day of July, 1869."

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he was not very clear as to the object of the hon. Member in the statement just made to the House; but he was glad to hear an admission that the Government had been actuated by no other feeling than one of duty in the measures they had taken for the preservation of the peace of Ulster. Language differing very greatly from this, however, had been held by Members of the Orange party, who had charged the Government with invading Ulster with an army of horse and foot, and insulting the Protestants of the North—language of the wildest and most unfounded kind, which it was agreeable to hear the hon. Member repudiate. He was glad also that the hon. Gentleman had fairly admitted that the Roman Catholic population of Ulster had in general acted with great prudence and forbearance on a recent occasion. From his intimate knowledge of all that had passed in Ulster he could fully confirm that statement. It was most fortunate for the peace of the North of Ireland that the Roman Catholic population, under circumstances in some cases of no small provocation, had, at the suggestion of their clerical advisers and others, maintained a most prudent and forbearing attitude. It was true that in some districts of the North of Ireland there might be no danger of a breach of the peace, but in other districts, where parties were more equally balanced, there was serious risk of the most fatal consequences as the result of these demonstrations. He could assure the hon. Gentleman and the House that in several districts, if the public authority had not been well represented by a sufficient force, there would have been great danger of hostile collisions, and, perhaps, of a lamentable loss of life. The hon. Gentleman said that these demonstrations were for the maintenance of the political and religious principles of the Ulster, Protestants. Now, he was not going to discuss the general state of Ulster or the history and present position of Orangeism; but it seemed to him that Protestants might well maintain their political and religious principles without the demonstrations which the hon. Gentleman seemed to think essential. Was it necessary for the purpose of maintaining the principles of Protestantism and their equal rights as citizens—which were not in the smallest degree endangered—to make these displays in the face of a population which could not but regard them as irritating? Was it necessary to make night hideous with firing and with drums, which resounded all over Ulster, and which were more worthy of some African village than of a flourishing province in Ireland? For the moment these displays might be inevitable, but he trusted and believed that they were not destined to be perpetual, and that the Protestants of Ulster would not think it necessary to support their political and religious principles, which he hoped they would always maintain, by keeping up these semi-barbarous and childish observances. In one important respect the hon. Member, whose general fairness he admitted, had exerted himself to avert the dangers which might arise—and did arise—from these great assemblages. The hon. Gentleman was strongly opposed to the dangerous and reprehensible practice of carrying arms on such occasions, but, as he knew, arms were in many instances carried. With regard to the particular occasions on which the police had come into collision with the people, the hon. Gentleman could scarcely expect the Government to express any opinion, because these cases were now the subject of inquiry. He did not believe that anything could be gained by going further into these matters in that House. There was great reason for congratulation that the 12th of July had passed off so well, and perhaps the least said the best. No doubt the law of the land, as embodied in the Party Processions Act, had been openly violated in a great number of cases; but, upon the whole, peace and order had been preserved, and the measures taken by the Government had proved effectual. As to the Reports asked for by the hon. Member, he could not consent to produce them, for it would be destructive of the relations between the Government and their officers if it were the practice to produce such Reports, except in cases of the most exceptional kind and supported by the strongest reasons. He congratulated the House and the country on the comparative success which had attended the efforts of the Government to preserve the peace in the North of Ireland.

Mr. VANCE said, one might imagine from the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland that there were no party processions in Ireland but those of Orangemen. He (Mr. Vance) recollected a procession of 80,000 persons, which was formed in Dublin to follow the remains of M'Manus, who had been convicted of treason; and also another procession in honour of those who were called the "Manchester martyrs," which was most alarming from its numbers, and from the principles of those who took part in it. Neither of those processions were interfered with, and he therefore maintained that the Party Processions Act had been very partially administered. The processions which took place in the North of Ireland were, for the most part, composed of loyal men, and were in support of the English connection, while those which took place in the South were composed of men who were not well affected to the Queen and Government of this country. The people of Ulster would never cease agitating until this penal enactment of the Party Processions Act was repealed.

Motion made, and Question,

"That there be laid before this House, Copies of Reports of the Stipendiary Magistrates relating to the state of Ulster on the 12th day of July 1869,"—(*Mr. William Johnston,*)

—put, and *negatived.*

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER—[BILL 23.]

(*Mr. Thomas Chambers, Mr. Morley.*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [8th June],

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make provision therein for a woman to marry her deceased husband's brother."—(*Mr. Collins.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. J. G. TALBOT appealed to the hon. and learned Member having charge of the Bill (Mr. T. Chambers) to withdraw it in consideration of the important measures now before Parliament, and the late period of the Session at which they had arrived. He moved that the Order be discharged.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Order for the Committee on the said Bill be read and discharged,"—(*Mr. John Talbot,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, he could not consent to the Motion; the appeal made to him had taken him by surprise. The measure had been passed by a majority of 99, and had before been sent to the Upper House on several occasions; it was a measure which touched the family honour and fears of many thousands of families, and under these circumstances he could not but deem himself entirely unworthy of the position he held if he insulted the House by withdrawing a measure endorsed by a majority of 99 votes. Admitting that measures of overwhelming national importance were before Parliament, he denied that any measure touched more nearly the honour of the people. He therefore trusted the hon. Member who had given notice to move an Instruction to the Committee (Mr. Monk), which he disliked as much as he disliked the Bill, would either move it or withdraw it, that the Bill itself might be proceeded with.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, he wished to correct the hon. and learned Member's chronology. It was not true that this Bill had been often sent to the House of Lords; it had never been there but once, and that was ten or twelve years ago; it was only once introduced into this House in the Parliament of 1865, and only once in the Parliament of 1862, on both of which occasions it was rejected. Although the second reading had been carried, the Bill had struck no responsive chord in the hearts of the people. He agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman that the measure did touch the honour of many families in the country. It wounded the most tender and delicate feelings of countless thousands of wives, sisters, brothers, and families.

VISCOUNT GALWAY said, he had always supported this measure, the opposition to which was carried on in a manner which he thought contrary to Parliamentary usage, and unworthy of the House.

VISCOUNT BURY said, he could not be suspected of hostility to the Bill, but he would advise the withdrawal of it, considering the late period of the Session, and the treatment which the Bill encountered. He was ashamed to think that a subject which ought, at any rate, to be discussed with a degree of decorum and respect should be made the vehicle for levity and attempts to discover words of double meaning and bad signification. Amendments were moved which were simply designed to cast ridicule on the Bill. As it would be almost impossible to force the Bill through the House against the determination of those who appeared to be so little particular as to the means they used to obstruct it, he would recommend his hon. Friend (Mr. T. Chambers) to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the advice just given came with considerable weight from the noble Viscount, because he had been for a long time desirous that a Bill of this kind should be passed, but the conclusion he arrived at could hardly be justified from his speech. With great frankness and plainness the noble Viscount had characterized the opposition to the Bill, which had been carried somewhat beyond the limits of Parliamentary usage; but he doubted whether it would be a salutary precedent to withdraw a Bill on account of such opposition. This was not a Cabinet question. Many highly respected Members of the Government were not favourable to the principle of the measure; but, personally, he felt bound to do what he could to assist the hon. Member in charge of the Bill. For many years he had felt the pressure of this subject to be extreme. Among certain classes the change proposed would not be without a disturbing effect on domestic relations; but these classes were limited and select, and it was the mass of the community we must look to in dealing with such a question. When he considered the weight of testimony given by ministers of religion, among the most respected in their several communions—men among the Roman Catholics, the Nonconformists, the Established Church—High Church and Low Church—including such a man as Dr. Hook, who might, perhaps, be described as the first parish minister of his day—when he considered the pressure of motives which had induced so many persons, who had practical experience of the consequences produced by the present state of the law, to support the proposed change he did not shrink from the responsibility it would entail. Some twelve or fourteen years ago he formed the opinion that the fairest course would be to legalize the marriage contracts in question, and legitimize their issue, leaving to each religious community the question of attaching to such marriages a religious character; and the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. T. Chambers) had shown a wise judgment and a conciliatory temper in reducing his demand to a minimum, and introducing a Bill to do no more than obviate the ruinous consequences of the present state of the law. The conduct of the hon. and learned Member gave him a strong claim to the support of all except those who conscientiously objected to the measure. The Bill was read a second time on the 21st April, by 243 against 144; the subject had been under discussion many years, so that the arguments for and against the proposed change of the law were well known, and it was not the fault of the author of the Bill that the Committee had not been taken long ago; and it was not equitable now to ask him to withdraw the Bill on the score of time. It had been remarked that there were other questions that were likely to occupy time during the remainder of the Session. He knew not the means of information possessed by hon. Members, or how it was they were able to form a judgment that those questions were likely to occupy so much the time of the House; whether that were so or not, he would express his opinion that they were bound to encourage the author of the Bill to set his face against obstructive opposition, and to aid him in securing a fair treatment of the Bill.

Mr. COLLINS said, he did not share the opinions of the First Minister, but he denied that the Bill was being met in a factious spirit. He must complain that it had not been put down for Wednesday, when it would have had a chance of being discussed. He protested against the system of having piecemeal discussions of important questions — ten minutes one day, and five minutes three months afterwards. The real question was the abolition of affinity as distinct from consanguinity; and, as the time was coming when relationship by marriage would cease, he protested against the exceptional legislation proposed by the Bill. What could be more absurd than to say that a man should be allowed to marry his deceased wife's sister, but not his deceased wife's daughter? It was following an unintelligible line to say that a man might marry the blood relations of his wife, but that a woman should not marry the blood relations of her husband. He should offer every opposition to the Bill, because it did not proceed upon a principle which could be defended.

Mr. O'REILLY - DEASE said, he wished merely to state that it was a mistake to suppose that the Church to which he belonged — the Roman Catholic

Church — was opposed to these marriages. He had received a requisition from Roman Catholic theologians of the diocese of Dublin, urging him to support the Bill. It was true that the Roman Catholic Church required a dispensation in the case of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but a Roman Catholic could have no dispensation for anything that was not in itself essentially lawful.

MR. BALL said, he wished to remind the House that in discussing this question it was scarcely possible to avoid a review of the entire marriage law of England, Scotland, and Ireland. About four years ago, a Royal Commission, composed of the very ablest men of both Houses, of the Bench, and the Bar, was appointed to inquire into the whole question of the marriage law. The Report of that Commission had been made last November, and it would be sufficient to say that it was drawn up by the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer), to indicate that it was characterized by remarkable ability and research. He thought the present Bill ought to be postponed. What he objected to was partial legislation on the subject of the marriage laws.

MR. CARNEGIE said, he thought that the hon. Member for Boston (Mr. Collins) was exceedingly adverse to going on late at night with business to which he was opposed, but very anxious to go on with any matter he was anxious to forward.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he did not rise to support the Motion of the hon. Member for Boston (Mr. Collins). He merely wished to call attention to the fact that the marriages proposed to be legalized by the Bill were detested in Scotland, though the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Carnegie) had risen to defend the speech of the Prime Minister, who had spoken as if he wished to propose that the word "not" should be struck out of the Seventh Commandment.

MR. DALGLISH said, he must express his opinion that the Bill was a proper Bill, and if the hon. Member for Boston should propose to add his clause to the Bill and withdraw his opposition he would support the hon Gentleman.

MR. M'LAREN said, that all the information which he had been able to gather from different parts of Scotland convinced him that the great majority of the people of that country were hostile to the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that if the Bill were to be advocated on the ground that marriage with a deceased wife's sister ought to be permitted because it was not prohibited by Scripture, that principle should be carried to its full extent, and it should be contended that all marriages not prohibited by Scripture should be legalized. He would not vote for the Bill, which was opposed to the religious feelings of the people of Scotland.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 143; Noes 57: Majority 86.

Main Question again proposed.

SIR JOHN HAY moved the adjournment of the Debate on the ground that some hon. Members had misunderstood the question as put from the Chair. In particular he had noticed that the Lord Advocate had voted in contradiction to his speech.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he could assure the hon. Baronet that his vote was entirely consistent with his sentiments on this subject.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir John Hay.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 43; Noes 145: Majority 102.

MR. MONK, in moving that it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to make provision for a man to marry his deceased wife's brother's or sister's daughter said, that he was glad of the opportunity of explaining his reasons for placing his Instruction on the Motion Paper, as he had been placed in rather a painful position in consequence of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade having found fault with him for not deferring his proposal until the Bill got into Committee. He had, however, consulted a higher authority on the rules of that House than the right hon. Gentleman, and he had been informed that the course he had taken was the preferable one. For his part he felt bound by the decision of the House, on the second reading, when the principle of the Bill was affirmed by a majority of 99, that principle being that it was expedient to amend the law as to marriage with a deceased wife's sister; but he considered it to be not only within the province but the duty of those opposed to the Bill and to exceptional legislation on marriage to endeavour so to amend it in Committee, as to make it consonant with justice and common sense. Upon those grounds he appealed to his right hon. Friend the First Minister of the Crown whether he was prepared to give his sanction to an alteration of the law of marriage that rested on no fixed or definite principle, at the very same time that the Report of the Royal Commission recommending the establishment of uniformity in the laws relating to marriage had now lain upon the table for seven or eight months. He always understood that the law of marriage so far as it related to cases of affinity and consanguinity was based on a clear and intelligible principle. Marriage was prohibited between persons so related within the fourth degree, and permitted in the fourth or a more distant degree. His Motion had reference to the basis on which the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone proposed to legislate. That basis he (Mr. Monk) maintained to be unsound. What did the Bill do? Of the thirty prohibited degrees the Bill proposed only to deal with one, which was in a nearer degree of affinity than many others, including those to which his Instruction referred. A more extraordinary proposal it would be difficult to imagine, though after thirty years' warfare Parliament was becoming accustomed to it. He ventured to say, if the present Bill were passed it would lead speedily to the abolition of half the existing prohibitions. Was it not monstrous to begin by removing the impediments to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, at the same time maintaining the obstacles to marriage with a deceased wife's niece?—to remove restrictions as regarded a near degree of affinity and allow them to remain as regarded a more distant one. That was a species of exceptional legislation, which he trusted Parliament would never sanction. Whatever was done in this matter ought to be done with sincerity and honesty; yet, if this Bill passed, it plainly could not be a final measure. His Instruction affected a deceased wife's niece, and he would remind the House that that marriage was not expressly forbidden in the Scriptures, but by implication only. In Leviticus, a man is forbidden to marry his aunt; by parity of reason a woman may not marry her uncle: therefore a man may not marry his niece. His (Mr. Monk's) contention was that it was contrary to the true spirit of the Constitution and repugnant to reason and sound sense that marriage should be legalized between persons in a nearer degree of affinity, while the law prohibited them in a more distant degree, and declared the children of such a marriage to be illegitimate. Did not the touching appeals on behalf of the offspring of an union between a man and his deceased wife's sister apply equally to the children of a marriage between a man and his deceased wife's niece? He could have wished that the House would pause before proceeding with so exceptional a measure; but if it decided upon going into Committee, common sense as well as justice demanded that it should throw the ægis of its protection over the deceased wife's niece at least as much as over the deceased wife's sister. He begged to move the Instruction of which he had given notice; but if the sense of the House were opposed to it he should not put them to the trouble of dividing.

Motion made, and Question,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make provision for a man to marry his deceased wife's brother's or sister's daughter,"—(*Mr. Monk,*)

—put, and *negatived.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Marriages with deceased wife's sister before the passing of this Act not to be void or voidable, and such marriages to be legal in future).

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE moved that the Chairman report Progress. After many years' opposition, the Prime Minister, for the first time, had spoken in support of the Bill. That might be a valid reason on the other side of the House for passing this measure, but Members on the Opposition Benches retained their old objections to it. The right hon. Gentleman made one remarkable suggestion; that the marriages should be legalized where they were solemnized, but that their actual celebration or non-celebration should be a matter left to the religious community in such case. A more direct casting down of the apple of religious discord among all bodies, whether of Churchmen or Dissenters, it was impossible to conceive. How was the necessary consent to be given in each case by the religious body, or by the ministers; in either case was it not plain how clergymen and individuals would all be at daggers drawn with each other, and what an amount of acrimony would be introduced into every locality? The suggestion having been thrown out by so high an authority as the Prime Minister as a sort of *obiter dictum,* they ought to pause and give the country time to examine the downward path down which it was invited to go. It was now one o'clock, and he begged to move that the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 39; Noes 129: Majority 90.

MR. COLLINS moved that the Chairman do now leave the Chair. The hour was very late, and as the House would resume business at noon it was but reasonable that Members should have a night's rest and a good breakfast before they met again.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. T. CHAMBERS *moved,* in Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out "which has been celebrated since the passing of the fifth and sixth of William the Fourth, chapter fifty-four," and insert "heretofore celebrated or contracted."

MR. HENLEY said, it was proposed to make these marriages valid when celebrated before the registrar, but not when celebrated in church. That was a most anomalous state of things, and they ought to have the opinion of the Government upon it.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, the object of his Amendment was to render the law in respect to these particular marriages uniform in Scotland and all the other parts of the Empire.

DR. BALL said, the Bill proposed to make a total innovation in the principle on which our marriage law was usually governed, because it would make the validity of the marriage depend on the place of contract and not on the place of domicile of the parties.

MR. M'LAREN said, the measure was adverse to the feelings of the most religiously disposed people in Scotland, and he would use the forms of the House in every way to prevent its introduction into that country.

MR. T. CHAMBERS maintained that there was a growing feeling in Scotland in favour of these marriages.

MR. ANDERSON denied that there existed in Scotland the strong and general aversion from these marriages which was alleged to exist.

MR. G. H. MOORE maintained that the people of Ireland of every class and every rank regarded these marriages with utter abhorrence. Certain excellent but misguided Catholic divines certainly did support them, in order that the Catholic Church might be enabled to grant dispensations in certain cases; but not deeming this a sufficient reason for passing the measure, he should give it all the opposition in his power.

MR. SERJEANT DOWSE said, he would support the Bill, as he hitherto had done, because it was not a Bill intended, as some appeared to think, to compel a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, or to provide a dead wife's sister for every man to marry.

VISCOUNT BURY said, that although willing to support the Bill as far as it related to England, he regretted that he could not assist his hon. Friend (Mr. T. Chambers) in extending its provisions to Scotland.

MR. M'LAREN read extracts to show that the first draft of the Bill only made such marriages legal for the future, whereas it was now proposed to legalize all these marriages where they had occurred.

THE LORD ADVOCATE observed that it was impossible to discuss a subject of this importance at that late hour —a quarter to two.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, he was willing to make the measure non-retrospective as far as Scotland was concerned, if the Scotch Members wished the children of the unhappy few to remain illegitimate.

MR. G. H. MOORE moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. George Moore.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 48; Noes 94: Majority 46.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

ADMIRALTY DISTRICT REGISTRIES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. GRAVES, Bill for establishing District Registries of the High Court of Admiralty in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. GRAVES, Viscount SANDON, and Mr. RATHBONE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 229.]

HACKNEY AND STAGE CARRIAGES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary BRUCE, Bill for amending the Law relating to Hackney and Stage Carriages within the Metropolitan Police District, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary BRUCE and Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 227.]

ZANZIBAR (JURISDICTION OF CONSUL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. STANSFELD, Bill to regulate and extend the Jurisdiction of Her Majesty's Consul at Zanzibar in regard to vessels captured on suspicion of being engaged in the Slave Trade; and for other purposes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. STANSFELD and Mr. AYRTON.

MILITIA (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE, Bill to amend "The Militia (Ireland) Act, 1854," as to providing houses or places for the keeping of the arms, accoutrements, clothing, or other stores of the Militia when not embodied, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 228.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 21*st July,* 1869.

MINUTES] — SELECT COMMITTEE—On Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [181], *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) [4]; Special and Common Juries [175].

Committee—Seeds Adulteration * [222]—R.P.

Committee—Report—Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment * [220-230]; Cinque Ports Act Amendment * [206].

Third Reading — Married Women's Property [122], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Adulteration of Food or Drink Act (1860) Amendment * [80]; County Coroners * [135]; Suburban Commons * [174].

LANGUAGE USED IN DEBATE IN THE OTHER HOUSE.—QUESTION.

MR. MILBANK: I wish to appeal to you, Sir, on a point of Order. I wish to know whether, in accordance with the Rules of this House, any apology or redress can be demanded in this House from a Peer who, in his place in the Upper House, uses language insolent towards the Prime Minister, the Leader of a great party, and insulting to the dignity of the House of Commons?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member give notice of a Question, or does he desire to address a Question?

MR. MILBANK: I merely rose to ask whether, as a matter of Order and Privilege, I have a right to ask the Question?

MR. SPEAKER: Neither as a point of Order, nor as a point of Privilege, can such a Question with propriety be addressed to me. The hon. Member ought himself to be aware that in this House we have no cognizance of what passes in debate in the other House. It is not our business to engage in any such inquiry.

HYPOTHEC ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—SECOND READING.

(*Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. Craufurd.*)

[BILL 4.] ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [5th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "pending the consideration (by a Committee of the House of Lords) of the whole question of the Law of Hypothec as existing both in Scotland and other countries, it is expedient to delay the further consideration of this Bill,"—(*Lord Elcho,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. ORR EWING said, he rose to resume the remarks which had been cut short on the previous occasion. His object in rising at that late period of the day was not for the purpose of shelving the question for this Session, but because he believed it to be a question of too great importance to go to a division upon without having all the arguments possible for and against the Bill, and many hon. Members were desirous of expressing their opinions. For instance, he was anxious to hear the grounds on which his hon. Friend opposite was willing to support the Bill on condition that urban property was secured from its operation. His hon. Friend would give them full and perfect reasons for the exception, and he (Mr. Orr Ewing) should entirely agree with him. But it was because there were just as sound reasons why the law should be applied to land that he opposed this Bill altogether. If his hon. Friend would refer to the evidence of 1866, he would find that the unanimous opinion of the witnesses was that if the Law of Hypothec were abolished as to land, it must be at the same time abolished with regard to houses and house property. He was sorry not to see the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire (Mr. M'Combie) in his place, representing as he did that important branch of intelligent, hard-working earnest men, the tenant-farmers of Scotland. He should like to have heard him give his reasons for desiring the abolition of the Law of Hypothec—what was the real grievance under which the tenant-farmers suffered, and show that they would be more prosperous if the law were abolished. He (Mr. Orr Ewing) believed that the interests of the landlord and the tenant were closely intermingled with each other—that the well-being of the landlord depended upon the prosperity of the tenant; and he believed, further, that it was the Law of Hypothec that had been the great means of making agriculture in Scotland what it was; and this because it had enabled a body of hard-working men to take farms which otherwise they would not have been enabled to take, and had enabled landlords to lay out money upon their farms in draining and other things that they would not have otherwise been able to do; and, above all, it had enabled them to grant long leases, and to delay the collection of the rents until fifteeen months after they became due. He might be told that the best evidence of the opinion of the tenant-farmers of Scotland on this subject was to be found in the result of the General Elections. But he (Mr. Orr Ewing) said that the decision in Scotland was not owing either to the Law of Hypothec or to the Game Laws, but entirely to the question of the Irish Church. As to the agricultural clubs, they were local institutions, got up for political purposes, and represented the wealthy capitalists, and not the great body of the tenant-farmers. These gentlemen had made statements that the effect of the Law of Hypothec is to raise the rents, and to prevent tenant-farmers from obtaining credit from bankers and manure-dealers. But he thought the gentlemen who made these statements did not well understand the grounds on which these people get credit at all. It was when a man was known to be a good man of business, of good character, and economical in his living, that he got credit, and not because of the Law of Hypothec. It was only when a man became bankrupt that the Law of Hypothec came into operation. Did any hon. Gentleman believe that the manure-merchants only dealt with men who would in their anticipations become bankrupts? If the manure dealers knew a man to be unsteady and thriftless, even though he had some capital, they would not give him credit, and would not if the Law of Hypothec were abolished to-morrow. These gentlemen also said—"Why should not the landlord be content to have the same security for his rent that a merchant has for his debts?" But he (Mr. Ewing) would like to ask hon. Members whether it was the case that merchants had not facilities by law to get a perfect security over every transaction into which they enter? If a merchant or manufacturer consigned goods, he expected to receive advances from the house to which he sends the goods, who has a lien over the property. He knew a case of a bankrupt estate to the amount of near £500,000, for £260,000 of which some of the creditors had got security, and were paid in full—the unsecured creditors—of whom, unhappily, he was one—were to have 8*d.* in the pound when they could get it. But, supposing it to be the case that the manure-dealer was not placed exactly in the same position as the owner of land, was there no reason why it should not be so? The manure-dealer had an opportunity from day to day, and from week to week, to ascertain the position of the farmer with whom he was dealing, and he could make his calculations whether he was likely to be paid or not. Men were never in difficulties, especially in that line of life, without its being well known to their neighbours. But the landowners did not stand in the same position. They let the land for nineteen years, and during the whole of the time they had no control over the land. They might have originally let the land to a well-to-do, well-meaning man, who might have since died, and his successor turned out a bad tenant, or he might have been ruined by bad debts, or speculations—surely such a tenant could not be regarded as an ordinary debtor. He should like to see the merchant who would enter into a transaction for nineteen years without having the strongest collateral security; it was perfectly absurd to compare the manure-dealer or the seed-dealer, who did business from week to week, with a landowner who lets his property for nineteen years at a stretch. Now who were the farmers who gave evidence before the Commission of 1865. Why, Sir, they were great capitalists holding farms, the rent of which ranged from £450 a year to £4,000, and there was one family which paid an annual sum of £14,000 for rent. And what was the history of that family? The father, late in life, got a farm for which he paid £100 a year, and he secured the assistance of three or four able, energetic sons in managing his business. These four men went on adding farm to farm, until, from renting a small farm into which the father would never have been put but for this very Law of Hypothec, they had become such capitalists as to hold land to the rental of £14,000 a year. And what did the evidence of these capitalist farmers amount to? Why, to this—that no man should be allowed to take a farm who had not sufficient capital; that men of capital had now to pay more for their farms, owing to the greatly increased competition because of this law; and that the law prevented the application of capital to land. Now, he would ask the House to consider whether this law did in fact artificially raise the value of land? Was it not the case that every business and profession was overcrowded, and that there was the greatest difficulty in any man choosing a direction in which to employ his ability and capital. He said it was a perfect mistake to suppose that there was a greater competition in the farming profession than in any other. Then, was it the case that the Law of Hypothec prevented capital being applied to land? Was there any country in the world where there was more capital applied to the land than in Scotland? He said, without fear of contradiction, that there was none. What was the practical effect of the law? Why, it absolutely gave, according to the computation of Mr. Jamieson, an accountant of Edinburgh, by reason of the delay in the collection of the rent, a capital of £7,500,000 to the tenant-farmers, wherewith to carry on their business. The system upon which land was let in Scotland was this —In the leases of arable farms the terms were nineteen years, and possession was given in the month of November, after the land had been ploughed. Grass and other lands were given possession of at Martinmas, and the rent was payable generally on an average of eighteen months after possession was given. If a farmer took possession of a grass farm, for which the leases range between nine and nineteen years, he got possession at Whitsuntide, paid half-a-year's rent at Martinmas, and the other half at the following Whitsuntide. So that on an arable farm the tenant had an opportunity of selling all the produce long before the rent is due, and on a grazing farm he had the produce of the land in his hands six months before the last half of the rent fell due. He did not advocate the maintenance of this law from the landlord point of view, although he believed sincerely, that they were well entitled to the protection of this law; but he advocated the maintenance of this law only in the tenant-farmers' interest. He believed the abolition of this measure was asked by great capitalists, for selfish purposes, and not for the benefit of the numerous class of tenant-farmers of Scotland. It was a contest between labour and capital, and he warned the House that if this Bill passed it would do the greatest injury to the tenant-farmers, and would prevent ploughmen and farm labourers, by frugality, self-denial, hard work, and skill, raising themselves into the position of tenant-farmers.

MR. CRAUFURD said, the question before the House was not, as the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire (Mr. Orr Ewing) evidently supposed, whether or not the Bill should be read the second time, but the Motion of the hon. Member for East Lothian, who did not go the length of moving the rejection of the Bill, but simply asked the House to postpone dealing with this question until the Committee that was sitting in "another place" had concluded its labours, and reported upon the evidence that had been laid before it. Singularly enough, Sir, the adjournment which his hon. Friend, who had charge of this Bill, was compelled to ask the House to assent to, had been of such length that they were now in a situation to deal with the whole question, for the Report of the House of Lords was now before them; and he would ask the careful attention of the House to the extraordinary nature of that Report, and to the evidence on which they pretend to found their opposition to any alteration of the law—for if hon. Members would look into the evidence they would find the most marvellous confirmation of the views he (Mr. Craufurd) and his Friends had always maintained in that House. He desired in particular to direct attention to the evidence of Mr. Hope, who stated that while the creditors sometimes got no dividend at all, and often a very small one, the landlord not only got 20*s*. in the pound, but sometimes a great deal more. Noble Lords, not a little astonished, asked how this was? Mr. Hope replied—

> "In this way. He gets 20*s*. in the pound until his rent is paid, and the unexhausted manures of the manure merchants and the improvements, liming, and draining, and other things being newly put into the land, the sequestration being laid very often in the third or fourth year. All those improvements are kept by the landlord, without his giving any value for them to the creditors, and he gets that sum 20*s*. in the pound."

Now, he (Mr. Craufurd) wanted to know if any hon. Member of that House would stand up and defend the law which gave to one creditor not only payment in full of his debts, but something more, to the detriment of other creditors? Was not such a law as that contrary to the whole spirit of our legislation in modern times, and contrary to the whole interest and benefit of the nation? It was contended by the supporters of the present law that the effect of the law was to give credit to the tenant-farmer, and to enable him to borrow money at a greater advantage; but the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire (Mr. M'Combie) said in his evidence over and over again that he has held back his hand from assisting worthy farmers struggling in difficulties because of the Law of Hypothec. He said that if the Law of Hypothec did not stand in the way, and all creditors shared alike in the assets, he would frequently have helped men out of their difficulties; "but this law," he says, "prevents me doing so, although I have confidence in the man." His hon. Friend said that he does not defend the old law, but that the modifications introduced by the Act of 1867 were sufficient for the protection of the tenant, and he points to the fact that there have been only a very small number of sequestrations under that Act. But sequestrations were not registered before 1867, and if it were true that so few have taken place since it was strong evidence of the honesty, industry, and trustworthiness of the tenants, and seemed to him the very strongest proof that the landlords would trust their tenants whether there be a Law of Hypothec or not. It had been said that the law included Law of Hypothec, and that the Law of Hypothec was the common law in all mercantile transactions. He (Mr. Craufurd) denied that this was the case. If hon. Members would not listen to him, they would probably listen to the evidence of the Lord Advocate before the Lords' Committee. He was asked—

> "This right of hypothec, then, does not apply only to agricultural property, but it runs through the whole of real estate?" Answer—"It does; it is not part of the law; and it is not founded upon the principle of the law merchant, and consequently it has no correct analogy to other principles in the law, such as the right of retention by an artifice of goods, which he has retained in order to perform work upon them, and of the rights of hypothec, which is really a right of retention, excepting as far as these also are instances of special preferential rights, arising by operation of law; but this Law of Hypothec between landlord and tenant is the offspring of the land tenures, and of the principles upon which they are regulated."

To the question, whether the right of hypothec did not apply to time charters, when a person hires a vessel, the owner of the vessel having the first claim over the cargo, as against all other creditors, the Lord Advocate replied—

> "That, again, is one of the rights of lien, arising out of the law merchant and out of the necessities of commerce. I do not consider that that is an analogy." "Do you not consider," he was asked, "the case of bottomry bonds an analogy?" The answer is, "I think not; a bottomry bond is a wager in very difficult circumstances, under which the creditor advancing his money is to get a very large return in the event of the vessel arriving safe, and in the event of the vessel not arriving safe, he gets nothing at all. I do not think that any very great light is to be thrown upon the question of the landlord's hypothec by those illustrations, excepting that it shows it is not inconsistent with the general principles of law that where the risk is unusually disproportionate to the interest there should be a special power of security. Beyond that I do not think there is much analogy in the cases. The real question is whether the landlord runs an unreasonable risk unless he has the right of hypothec, and on that question I think there is a great deal to be said both on the one side and on the other."

Now, he (Mr. Craufurd) would like to know what the learned Lord thought was the unreasonable and disproportionate risk which the landlord runs. The landlord could never lose his land—the utmost he can lose is a quarter or half-a-year's rent. He would, from the necessity of the case, be in a better position without the Law of Hypothec than the manure merchant, inasmuch as his capital is secure, whereas the manure merchant risks both capital and profit. Let me now refer to what the Lord Advocate says in relation to the objection that if the Law of Hypothec were abolished every landlord would fore-rent his farms. The learned Lord is asked—

> "It would be a considerable disturbance of the customs generally accepted in the country, would it not if fore-renting were to be the usual practice?" His reply is—"I am only speaking from impression, and my impression is that, even if the Law of Hypothec were abolished, the landlords would not fore-rent their farms. I think they would find, in the present state of matters, that it would be impossible to do so."

He (Mr. Craufurd) believed that landlords would understand their interests much too well to oppress their tenants by fore-renting; but, supposing they did fore-rent, what would it amount to? As they got payment at an earlier date they would have to discount it by accepting lower rents. Then again it had been argued that the Law of Hypothec had enabled ploughmen and labourers to rent farms and become wealthy men; and it was asked would you abolish a law that has worked so beneficially? There was no fallacy more absurd than the *post hoc propter hoc*. The evidence given before the Committee tended to show that these men rose in spite of the Law of Hypothec, and not in consequence of it; and he believed it would be found that for one man who has succeeded under that law hundreds had failed. If the Law of Hypothec were swept away to-morrow, landlords would still stand in a much higher and stronger position than any other class of creditors. And he was confident that if any impartial person, interested neither on the side of the landlords nor on the side of the tenants, would carefully consider the evidence the conclusion at which he would arrive would not be in accordance with the recommendation in the Report of the Committee in the House of Lords that the law should not be touched.

Mr. READ said, he knew how very dangerous it was for an English Member to take part in a Scotch debate; and he never ventured to do so except on one occasion; and he was then told that he had better attend to his own business. But he believed this question to affect not only the tenant-farmers of Scotland, but also those of England, and that was his excuse to Scotch Members for venturing to say a few words upon it. Now, the difference which existed on this subject on the north and the south side of the Tweed was very remarkable, and to him seemed quite incomprehensible. In Scotland this question was, no doubt, made a great party cry at the last election; but he could assure the House that during that election he was never asked, either in public or in private, what was his opinion with regard to the law of distress; he never heard it debated either in any agricultural society or in any Chamber of Agriculture. It might be that the tenant-farmers of England were so ignorant or so stupid that they did not know or feel the depth of degradation in which they were sunk, and that they required the intelligence of their brother agriculturists in Scotland to show them how helpless was their condition. He did not think, from what he could understand of this question, that there was any very great difference between the law of distress and the Law of Hypothec. It might be that there was a difference. It appeared as if the Scotch law with respect to sequestrations enabled the landlords to give longer credit to the tenant than was given in England; but, on the other hand, the law of distress in England enabled landlords to go back for a long period, the tenants in this country generally only having three or six months' credit for their rent. Now, there was a good deal to be said both for and against the present law. As a large farmer and a man having a fair capital, he should say that it certainly produced undue competition for land, and that it often induced landlords to accept men of straw instead of looking out for men of substance. But if he were a small farmer, a man struggling in the lowest scale of agriculture, one whose capital consisted chiefly in his industry and his economy, he really thought he should be in favour of a Law of Hypothec. Why, how was it that a small farmer in England ever succeeded? Was it not because he did the work of two labourers and lived with the expense of one, and that through the indulgence of his landlord he was enabled to tide over those seasons of calamity and distress which must overwhelm and ruin him under different circumstances? He believed that if the law of distress in England were abolished to-morrow, and there were fore-rents instead of back-rents, half the small farmers in England would be ruined. In theory the argument was, he admitted, entirely in favour of the abolition of this law; the preference of the landlord was theoretically unjust, and it was not right that the man who risked only his income should be placed in a better position than the man who risks his property as well. But being a practical man, he looked to the result, and he found the result to be this—that the only man who was really compelled to give credit was the landlord; that the trader could make what terms he pleased, and the trading interest could find no fault in this respect with the agricultural interest; for although it might be slow in paying, it was sure; and that ninety-nine farmers out of every 100 pay 20*s*. in the pound, even without the aid of the Bankruptcy Law. He was not contented with merely stating his own opinion, he would, with the permission of the House, state that of his brother-farmers in Norfolk. Last year, having been asked to read a paper before the Statistical Department of the British Association on the advancement of Norfolk agriculture, he prepared a series of questions, which he sent to fifty of the chief farmers in that county. One question was this—"What do you consider the chief hindrance to the further development of Norfolk agriculture?" The great majority of the causes assigned were insecurity of tenure, the operation of the Malt Tax, the over-preservation of ground game, and the increase of local taxation. There were several causes given, but not a single person mentioned the law of distress as a hindrance to the progress of agriculture. The replies came, be it observed, not from small farmers, but from men of large capital, men of intelligence and skill, men who had converted the naturally barren soil of Norfolk into one of the most productive soils in England; and he thought the opinion of such men ought to have some weight even with the Members for Scotland.

MR. M'LAREN said, he wished to refer to one part of the question which had not been touched upon by any Member who had spoken. He alluded to that part which dealt with the town populations in the same manner as farmers were dealt with in the counties. Now, he ventured to say that they ought to be dealt with in a totally different manner. And he was in a position to say that when the deputation waited on the Government to suggest the issue of a Commission, not one word was said that houses should be included in the inquiry, and accordingly when the Commission was issued its attention was directed entirely to agricultural affairs, nor did the Commissioners put a single question, except incidentally, as to how a change in the law would affect the owners and renters of houses in towns. He (Mr. M'Laren) was quite prepared to show that there was no natural connection between the two cases, and that the interests of the occupants of houses would be injuriously affected by the application of the Bill to that kind of property, and unless the towns were to be exempted from the operation of the Bill he should vote against it. The cases of farms and houses, he repeated, were not, in the slightest degree, analogous. In cases of houses let at high rents no difficulty could arise—the difficulty lay with that very large class who could afford to pay only £5 or £10 rent. At present such persons had no difficulty in obtaining dwellings, because the landlord had a security in the furniture, and it would be impossible for the many thousands of tenants of that class to give any other kind of security. In short, the greatest difficulties would arise if the Bill were made to extend to the case of houses in towns. It might be thought that the agricultural part of the question is so much greater than the town part that the latter ought to sink in the former. But that is not the case. From a Return which was moved for by the hon. Member for the Wick Burghs it appeared that, in the case of the agricultural subjects referred to in that Return, there had been 800 sequestrations during the last five years. That was a very small number indeed, comparatively, even if the process were in all cases carried out to the full extent of the law, which was not at all likely to have been the case. Consider the enormous value of the house property which would be affected by this alteration in the laws. The rents in Glasgow amounted to £1,750,000 a year; the rents in Edinburgh exceeded £1,000,000 a year; and the occupiers would be put to great expense and inconvenience in finding other security if the protection now enjoyed by the owners were removed. Such a course would resemble the Chinese plan of roasting a pig by burning down the house. The only justification was to be found in the sovereign will and pleasure of those who wished to include houses in order to secure uniformity. He entirely approved of the Bill as regarded the tenant-farmers, and if the hon. Gentleman would limit it to their case he would vote for it; otherwise he must vote against it.

THE MARQUESS OF LORNE said, he was not in favour of the total abolition of the Law of Hypothec, but he did think it necessary that some modification should be made in the law, and thought it very desirable if the law of distress as it existed in England could be applied to Scotland. He should vote for the second reading of the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, there could be no doubt that this question was an important one, and he thought it was very strongly considered at the last election that it would be the duty of the Government to endeavour to deal with it. His own impression was that there was a great deal of practical grievance on the one side, and a great deal of practical benefit on the other, and he would briefly explain to the House the view which, after due consideration, he took of this question. In his evidence before the Lords' Committee, he said that he thought the Law of Hypothec was not the offspring of the law merchant, but of feudal relations; and that, therefore, there was not sufficient analogy, in point of principle, between those liens or rights of retention which the law merchant had introduced in certain cases and this Law of Hypothec. Speaking as a jurist, he might say that the peculiarity of the Law of Hypothec consisted in this—that there was given, in this instance, what the law does not give in any other — security over movable property without possession. It had been said, and the statement might be true, that to a certain extent the landlord retained possession of his land, and only ceded to the tenant the productive quality of it; but still the peculiarity which he had mentioned remained; and therefore, in point of theory, you could not show any analogy between this case and others which had been introduced for the purpose of comparison. But when they looked at the practical question, there could be no doubt that the landlord was neither more nor less than a creditor holding security; that security not being latent but patent. Under the former law the landlord could follow grain which the merchant had sold, and that was inconsistent with what I have just mentioned; but since registration had been introduced no creditor could be deceived as he might have been previously. The landlord was therefore, he said, a creditor holding security which was patent. Now, his own belief was that, in point of principle, it would be better if this law did not exist. He did not say that it was Protection, or that it militated against Free Trade; but he thought that in all probability those who were engaged in agriculture would thrive in the end fully as well, if not better, without it. On the other hand, unless there were a real and substantial grievance, he should hesitate to run the risk which transition would necessarily involve. He thought that in the more cultivated districts the Law of Hypothec was of little avail; but that in the less cultivated rural districts of Scotland the abolition of the law would give rise to great inconvenience, and prove subversive of the relations of landlord and tenant, and therefore, though he should be disposed to agree to considerable modifications of the law, he could not consent to its total abolition. He did not think the House would be disposed to refuse to read the Bill a second time, on the understanding that considerable modifications would hereafter be introduced. As regarded the interest of landlords in this question, he believed that the landlord must ordinarily get the full value of his land, and under no circumstances could or ought he to get more. An attempt to get more than the full value must injure himself, and an investment which was bad for the tenant would be bad also for him. He believed that inquiry would show that landlords had after all been great losers by hypothec, not as regards existing rents, but in the trouble, annoyance, and expense which always occurred in connection with bankruptcy proceedings. He did not think landlords would lose at all by the abolition of the law. They had a commodity to dispose of, and in a fair market they were sure to get the full value of that commodity. Just as if there were no security in the case of freight, goods would continue to be carried, so he believed land would not suffer in value by the abolition of the present law. The ultimate effect would probably be very slight, just as the effect would be slight if an artificer who now had the right of retention for the price of his work were deprived of it. He could not say that he had a great deal of sympathy with the individual tenant who made a complaint on this subject in connection with his lease. He knew what he was bargaining for, and he (the Lord Advocate) did not think he had any fair ground of complaint. He would make a similar remark with respect to ordinary creditors in cases of bankruptcy. Those creditors knew that the landlord had a special security, and that unless the claims of the landlord were satisfied they would get nothing. All these things had been greatly magnified and exaggerated. The question must be looked at a little more in relation to principle. They all knew that in cases of this kind it was not easy to forecast the result of legislation of this kind in a few sentences; but he would endeavour to state what it appeared to him would be the real result of the abolition of the law. As a landlord was a creditor with security, it necessarily follows that the law in relation to land was founded upon the landlord's right. The Law of Hypothec operated quite as much when the tenant was solvent as in cases of bankruptcy. Bankruptcy was the exception; and the first question to be considered was whether the landlord was likely to offer the same terms without the Law of Hypothec as with it. It seemed to him by no means certain that this would be the case. The existence of a special security tended directly to limit the terms—in other words, the rent of the land, and the taking away of the security must have a tendency to increase the rent. Take the most familiar instance, that of a lender holding the security of an estate. While such security can be obtained, money was lent at 4 per cent; but if a law were passed forbidding anyone to mortgage his land, one result would be that a higher rate of interest would be demanded; just as in the case of freight if there were no security, owners of vessels would demand higher rates to cover the risk. The direct tendency of the abolition of the Law of Hypothec must be to alter the terms and conditions on which land is held. At present a landlord gave consideration for what he received in rent in the shape of a lease; but it was questionable whether he would do so if deprived of the security which he had in the Law of Hypothec. Whether it would be better for the tenant to be placed in that position is a question for him to consider. If the landlord exacted his rent—say £500—much sooner than he had hitherto done, the tenant would not have that money available for the purposes of his farm, and he must either abstain from using the money in that way, or must seek credit to meet his wants. His opinion was that the existing Law of Hypothec lowered rents, and that whether rent be raised in money value or on the conditions on which the tenant occupied his farm, the result was much the same. In all such matters as these there were collateral circumstances to be considered, and he should hesitate very much before advocating the abolition of the present law. He did not think the effect of that would be to drive small tenants out of the field; but he thought it would cause them to endeavour to eke out a livelihood by relying more on their own manual labour and less on hired servants. He believed that the small tenants paid the rents the best, and he was afraid that the abolition of the law would lower the status of that class of tenants. There was another point to which he might refer to. Up to the present time the Scotch had had a most flourishing system of leases, under which they had had improving leases granted by the landlords to a large extent. It was said that tenants without capital have taken farms, and no doubt there had been a good deal of that. Of course this had been prejudicial, because the good farms had thereby been brought up to an artificial value; but the matter was one that would always right itself, because the landlords would not go on giving farms to men who would not pay their rents merely because they undertook a larger obligation than those who would. But, on the other hand, he could not understand that where the landlord was satisfied and the tenant was satisfied, and those who dealt with the tenant were satisfied, those who want to take a farm, but have not done so, should complain of the operation of the law and ask to have it abolished. The class of small farmers in Scotland was an important class, and a great deal of the improvement which had taken place in Scotland is owing to their exertions. By abolishing the present law they would be checking this improvement; because they would be inducing the tenant simply to live on his bare substance instead of showing an ambition to get on by improving his farm. These were his suggestions as to the tendency which the abolition of the existing law would, in his opinion, have. On the other hand, if the whole country could show a ready market, an easy means of communication, and a ready means of turning produce into money, he should not think the law of sufficient value to make it worth while to retain it; but when he looked at the small farms, and applied the considerations he had just urged, he was compelled to arrive at a different conclusion. On these grounds he was not prepared to assent to the Bill of his hon. Friend to the full extent; but he would state what he was prepared to assent to. In the Bankruptcy Bill, which was sent the other day to the House of Lords, the landlord's right of distress in England was cut down from twelve months to six months. It was a question whether in the other House to which that Bill has been sent that clause will be retained. On the other hand, they had the Report of the Committee of the House of Lords —a Report to which his hon. and learned Friend referred in somewhat strong terms, and in reference to which he (the Lord Advocate) was bound to say that he thought no one who had read the Report and the evidence could fail to see that there was a great deal of evidence in the direction of the conclusions embodied in the Report. He had now to say that he was prepared, on the part of the Government, to allow the Bill of his hon. Friend to be read a second time, on the understanding that he would not press it further this Session. He could understand a proposition that the law of Scotland should be assimilated to that of England, in which case the landlord would have a right of distraint similar to that which he has in England. He could not understand the observation of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) that it was possible to retain the right of the landlord in towns, and to abolish it in the country, because he did not see on what ground a law of that kind can be applied to the towns without being equally applicable in the country.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he could not understand how his right hon. and learned Friend (the Lord Advocate), after the strong arguments he had used, in reply to the opinions which had been circulated throughout the country, as to the benefit to be derived by the tenant-farmers from the abolition of the law, could agree to the second reading of this Bill which went so directly to the teeth of his arguments. It was most important to understand what they were really voting upon. They were not about to vote on the question whether the law of Scotland proceeded on the principle of an excess of what may be rigidly required in the interest of landlord and tenant, nor whether some abatement of the law might be made in the interest of the community generally; but they were discussing the question whether the law should not be totally abolished, and whether the landlords should have any other remedy beyond that which is accorded to other creditors. He (Sir Edward Colebrooke) could not go to the extent of the proposal of the hon. Member for

Forfarshire. He thought his hon. Friend ought to consent to re-consider the question, and to bring in a measure which would have the effect of abating whatever seemed to be an excess in the law of Scotland beyond that of other parts of the United Kingdom, and that he should withdraw the present Bill. This would give them an opportunity of seeing whether they could not come to some understanding by which all that was anomalous in the law of Scotland might be remedied, so that ultimately they might agree upon a law based on principles applicable to the United Kingdom generally. This question was not to be argued upon any narrow or selfish ground of classes. It must be discussed as a principle, appealing not merely to landlords and tenants, but to all who had to deal with them. In this view, no distinction could be made between landlords and tenants in agricultural counties and in towns. It seemed to him that his hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate was somewhat hasty in assuming that this law was an offspring of our feudal relations. Much prejudice had been raised by the statement; but the law did not originate in the times of barbarism or feudalism, but was derived from the Roman law—from which it had descended—not merely to Scotland, but to every part of Europe, and even to the United States. As to the proposition that the landlord should be placed on the same footing as any other creditor, he thought that, considering the risk which the proprietor run in letting valuable property, whether a farm or a house, he was entitled to a fair amount of protection; and if this should be withheld from him, he would inevitably be driven to the necessity of protecting himself in a manner which might be far more injurious to the interests of the tenant than anything which could arise out of the present state of the law. No one could doubt the power the landlord in towns had of protecting himself. He might resort not merely to beforehand payments, but even to a system of weekly tenancies; but as regards landed property this was impossible. The conditions upon which a tenant entered upon a farm were such that he could only expect to reap the produce in order to pay the rent. There was no doubt that under these circumstances the landlord ran considerable risk. He thought there had been a monstrous amount of exaggeration as to the advantages the tenants would derive from the abolition of this law. He could not say whether rents would rise or fall; but, certainly, the abolition would most injuriously affect the smaller farmers. But this was not merely a landlord and tenant question; it was a question which also concerned those who dealt with the tenants. If it were true that the law inflicted injury on third parties, that might be a sufficient reason for its abolition; but it was shown in the evidence given before the Commission that the third parties, such as the seed and manure merchants, if they only exercised proper precautions, were free from any considerable amount of risk. Possibly the tenant might have to pay a little more — 2 or 3 per cent — for his goods, by way of his merchant's insurance; but this was the measure of the mischief. Believing that this law on the whole, whatever might be said with regard to some of its details, was beneficial to the interests of the community, and that its total abolition would be attended with disastrous results, he could not vote for the second reading.

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN said, that in the case of a law which conferred exceptional privileges on one class of the community at the expense of all others, the burden of proof lay not upon those who would abolish, but on those who would maintain such a law. In the particular case before us, special protection is extended by law to that class who, from the nature of their property, stand far less in need of such protection than any other class in the country. A landlord who appeared as a creditor, claiming against his bankrupt tenant, could under no circumstances fail to recover his principal in the shape of his land; the worst that could possibly befal him was the loss of his rent or interest for a certain limited period. But those creditors who have furnished the tenant with various agricultural appliances, as essential to good husbandry as even the land itself, lose all ownership in the articles supplied, and have only a personal claim against the bankrupt for interest and principal alike. Then, in addition to recovering his land, he had a preferential claim for his rent upon the crop of the year for which the rent is due. Such a preferential security cannot fail to act injuriously to the interests of agriculture by the fatal blow which it gave to the credit of the farmer in his dealings with bankers, merchants, and tradespeople—indeed, with all the world, except his landlord. On the other hand, the special security enjoyed by the landlord stimulated undue competition for farms by placing men without skill or capital in a position to bid successfully against prudent and experienced farmers. Landlords in general had ceased to defend the existing law as beneficial to themselves, but professed to support it in the interests of the smaller tenantry. There could be no doubt that if it were abolished, landlords—or rather their factors—would be obliged to exercise greater judgment in selecting tenants possessed of skill, capital, and good character; and he believed that it was from this class, upon whom the responsibility would be thrown, that the chief opposition to the Bill had arisen.

Mr. GRAHAM said, it seemed to him that the question was divided into two parts, the first relating to the landlords in the agricultural districts—and this was one upon which a very strong feeling existed in Scotland. It was a question that had been discussed on every hustings during the late elections, and he believed that the general feeling of the farmers of Scotland was in favour of the principle enunciated in this Bill. With regard to the other question—as to the right of distraint in towns—no such point was ever mooted at the hustings, nor had any complaint been made to this House or to the Commission with reference to any evil alleged to have arisen in connection with this matter. The possession of a house and furniture was a necessity to the labouring man. A man who came into a town where he could not get a house for his family and his furniture was incapable of gaining a livelihood; but the possession of a farm was not a necessary of life to any man, because, at the worst, a man might obtain a living as an agricultural labourer. So far as the lien over household property in the towns was concerned, he fully concurred in the argument that there should be no abolition of that law; but, with regard to the Law of Hypothec, as applicable to farms, he regarded that as a totally different question; and unless the hon. Member for Forfarshire was prepared to preserve the distinction between urban and agricultural hypothec, he could not support his measure.

Lord GARLIES said, that the question whether this law was of Roman or feudal origin seemed to him not at all to the point—the question, to his mind, was—simply whether the law practically worked for good—whether it was really beneficial, or whether it was not. He must say that after what they had heard from the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate to the effect that in his opinion the law on the whole is a satisfactory law, and that it would be a great pity to abolish it, he thought the conclusion the right hon. Gentleman had come to—that he would support the second reading of the Bill—was a most illogical one. It seemed to him that there had only been three points stated in favour of the Bill, one, that the retention of this law was a mere relic of feudalism; and next, that the law was beneficial to the small tenants, All he (Lord Garlies) could say was that the small tenants did not themselves seem to state so. The third argument was that of the hon. and learned Member for Ayr Burghs (Mr. Craufurd)—namely, that the Report of the Committee appointed by the other House to inquire into this subject was totally at variance with the evidence which they took. Now, he himself had only just become aware that that Report had been issued; but the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate had just informed the House that he had been carefully through the evidence, as well as the Report of the Committee, and that, in his opinion, the Report was very well substantiated by the evidence. He considered that this question in reality affected five particular classes—namely, the landlords, the large occupiers, the small occupiers, the merchants and the land itself. With regard to the first four of those points, there had been so much discussion upon them already that he would not trouble the House by entering upon them; but as regards the soil itself, he could not help thinking that one great reason for preserving the law in Scotland was that it tended to the improvement of the land. If they were to abolish the Law of Hypothec entirely, there could not be a doubt that they would induce the landlords to give up the present wholesome plan of giving long leases, and that, practically, it would come to their giving leases for a year, or at any rate, a very much shorter period than at present. With regard to the question of reserving the law as to urban property they seemed to him to have got into a very curious position. Some who were in favour of the agricultural hypothec were about to vote against the Bill because it included the urban hypothec; while the Lord Advocate supported the Bill because he was opposed to its principle. He thought this alone a reason why the hon. Member for Forfarshire should withdraw the Bill. No man in Scotland could tell why the Bill had been introduced at all, or what any hon. Member really thought about it. The fact was the Bill was an election cry, and an election cry was always an abolition cry; and at the last election the two chief cries — after the Irish Church question—were abolition of the Game Laws and abolition of hypothec. Moreover they were not national cries at all, but cries got up by certain local nonentities who desired to raise themselves into importance. All he would further say was that he was convinced that if this Bill should pass into law it would put the landlords into a false position of illiberality towards their tenants; that it would further have the effect of preventing a very praiseworthy class of men—namely, the small tenants in Scotland — from retaining the advantage of occupying a position of independence; and that it would act against the further improvement of the land in Scotland. He would support the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire.

MR. GRIEVE was understood to object to the mixing up of the two questions of the Law of Hypothec in the urban and in the agricultural districts. He should be sorry to vote against the Bill, and he therefore hoped the hon. Member for Forfarshire would consent to eliminate the urban element from the Bill.

MR. M'LAGAN said, it was very evident that hon. Members who have spoken upon this subject may be divided into two classes—namely, the urban and the agricultural Members — and it seemed almost impossible that the Bill could be argued on its principle on that account. The arguments of some hon. Members who were opposed to the Law of Hypothec were rather amusing. The hon. Member for Edinburgh argued that it would be very improper and very injudicious to abolish the urban hypothec, because it would injuriously affect a large amount of urban capital. He forgot that if you abolish agricultural hypothec it would also affect most injuriously a very large amount of agricultural property. The hon. Member had also taken a case in which a farmer on entering his farm laid out £1,500; he became bankrupt, the landlord recovered the land, and with it the £1,500 which had been invested in it. But he forgot the converse case—which occurred far more frequently—in which a bad tenant run out and exhausted the land, so that the landlord lost not only his rent but his capital was deteriorated. The hon. Member for Edinburgh also stated that urban hypothec was in a different position from agricultural hypothec, inasmuch as the creditors do not suffer to so large an extent from the failure of the urban tenant as they do from the failure of an agricultural tenant. But there was the case stated by the hon. Member for Forfarshire where the tenant takes a house, purchases furniture for which he does not pay, becomes bankrupt, and the landlord takes the whole furniture for his rent, and the seller loses every penny. In point of fact, this question was one which could not be argued in such a way as to separate the urban from the agricultural element. He would argue the question very much upon the ground on which it had been argued by the hon. Member for Edinburgh—namely, on the ground of expediency. The law was a relic of class legislation, and instead of dealing with it as such, which would only intensify it, they must deal with it on principles—they must consider the entire question of preferential securities. If it be wise to abolish the Law of Hypothec in agriculture it was right to abolish the law as applied to towns; and if it was right to abolish it in those cases, they ought also to abolish it in the case of the ship-owner, of the legal agent, and the money-lender. His main reason, however, for upholding the law was, that it was the most expedient mode they had by which the landlord and tenant enter into agreements with each other. If they were to abolish the law, the landlord must have some other security. He would be sure to devise some means of obtaining security before he lets the land to the tenant, and in all probability those means would be much more severe than the present Law of Hypothec. There was another point. If the landlord demanded security, the tenant would be running to all his friends and neighbours asking them to come forward as his securities, and thereby would be created a most obnoxious system of securities and warranties, which was always very much to be deprecated. The hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read) had put a distinction between hypothec in Scotland and distress in England very generally before the House, but he (Mr. M'Lagan) did not think that he had told them all he might have told. He could show that the proprietors of England had far greater security than those of Scotland. In the first place, the proprietor in Scotland could only use his rights of hypothec upon certain portions of the property of the tenant—for instance, he could not touch the furniture of the tenant. Now, in England, the proprietor could seize the whole of the property of the tenant that happens to be upon the farm. Again, the proprietor in Scotland could only exercise his right after going to the court and taking out a sequestration against the tenant, which he did publicly; but a proprietor in England, when the tenant did not pay his rent upon the day it was due, might put a man in possession of the farm and all upon it, and prevent the tenant from performing any operation upon the farm. Again, the proprietor in Scotland could only use his right of hypothec within three months after the rent was due, but the proprietor in England could do that for a year after the rent was due. The only advantage which the proprietor in Scotland had over the proprietor in England was that he could hypothecate the crops of the tenant prospectively, and that advantage arose from the different mode under which the rent is paid in Scotland as compared with this country. The rents in England were mostly fore-rents, in Scotland they were back-rents. In England a clause was inserted in the lease that the tenant must pay the first half-year's rent three months or six months after he entered, whereas in Scotland it was not paid for fifteen months, which gave the tenant very great advantage over his brother in England. He wished to remind the hon. Member for Forfarshire of what occurred on the Commission of which they were both Members. Mr. Elliott, a great opponent of the Law of Hypothec, then said that if they abolished the Law of Hypothec, they must have a law of ejectment much easier and more stringent. At present it was most difficult to eject a tenant even for non-payment of rent; the lease generally having a clause providing that he must go out on becoming bankrupt. His conclusion was that if the hon. Member for Forfarshire would consent that his Bill should be re-modelled so as to be a measure not for the abolition of the Law of Hypothec, but for modifying it, he would give him his support; but if not, he should vote for the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, he was glad to hear from the Lord Advocate that in his opinion there ought to be a Law of Hypothec, and that there was no distinction between the two cases of the urban and agricultural hypothec; indeed, he did not think that any hon. Member had attempted to uphold the distinction. But his object in rising was to appeal to the hon. Member for Forfarshire to withdraw it for the present Session. It was only that morning that Members had received a copy of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, which contained some valuable evidence as to the state of the question as affecting land in many European countries. It would not be right to affirm the principle of the Bill until the arguments adduced by the Committee of the House of Lords had been considered. Another reason against passing the Bill was that only two years ago the Law of Hypothec was greatly modified, and the manure and seed merchants placed in a much more favourable position, and he thought it was not advisable to make any further changes until it was seen how the law worked. He thought that, considering the discussion that had taken place, and that it was impossible that the Bill should become law this Session, the hon. Member would do well to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. ELLICE said, he hoped his hon. Friend would listen to the appeal made to him, and withdraw the Bill. He was always well inclined to follow the advice given by the Lord Advocate, who was generally a man of prudent and moderate counsels; but he must say that on this occasion he thought his right hon. Friend was asking the House to stultify itself. They were asked to read the Bill a second time. That meant to affirm the principle of the Bill. The object of the Bill was described to be "to abolish the Law of Hypothec in Scotland." Now it seemed to him that to abolition by far the larger number of Members, even on the Ministerial side of the House, were opposed. He would urge on the hon. Member, as he had urged on Sir James Ferguson when the late Government were in power, to assimilate the law strictly to the law of England. What was right in respect to England was right in respect to Scotland, and to that extent he thought the present law should be abolished. But if the Bill were restricted to that, it took nine out of ten words out of the Bill. The Bill involved two principles—the alteration of the Law of Hypothec as regards the tenant in counties and in boroughs. His constituents were totally opposed to the latter. As regards the agricultural tenant, he had read the Report of the Committee of the Lords, and he must say that, although most witnesses were adverse to the Law of Hypothec, they altogether failed to substantiate their case. It was evident that, with regard to the amount of capital, the effect of the abolishing the law would be to restrict the number of small tenancies, and to throw them into large farms, and the result would be that while a distinguished Member of the Government was advocating the creation of a small proprietary, this law would tend to destroy the small tenants and to throw them back into the condition of labourers. He defended the present law on the ground of expediency. He thought it ought to be assimilated to the law of England; but in other rerespects he would be sorry to see the law abolished.

MR. CARNEGIE, in reply, said that the general arguments used against the Bill appeared to resolve themselves principally into the case of the small tenants. Now, there was a witness—Mr. James Sinclair—examined before the Hypothec Commission who came from a part of the country where the tenancies were almost all fore-rented, and where, consequently, the Law of Hypothec was a dead letter.. He (Mr. Carnegie) asked this gentleman whether he had any difficulty in getting good tenants for these small fore-rent farms. He replied—

> "We find no difficulty in getting good tenants paying fore-rents. Most of the tenants on my own property are either the sons of small farmers or have been small crofters or blacksmiths, or persons connected in a small way with agriculture." He was then asked—"It does not consist with your knowledge that fore-rents have prevented these people from taking farms and raising themselves?" and the answer was—"No; I have never found any difficulty in letting a farm."

In answer to another Member of the Commission, he stated that the tenants under £50 were diminishing; but he gave it as his reason that no tenant could afford to take a farm which would not afford a threshing-machine. It seemed, therefore, as a matter of fact that where fore-rents existed they did not prevent the better class of labourers and others from getting small farms. The learned Lord Advocate had made a sort of proposal to him which he had some difficulty in quite understanding. Of course, he knew that if he read the Bill a second time he could go no further with it—the period of the Session showed that—but he should certainly take a division on the second reading. But if his hon. Friend meant that he should have his support if he took the second reading on the condition that he would modify the Bill, he would certainly do nothing of the sort. Next Session his hon. and learned Friend could make any proposition for a modification of the law; but for himself (Mr. Carnegie) he should certainly take the very earliest opportunity next Session of re-introducing the Bill. With regard to the urban hypothec, his object in introducing the Bill was to remove the evils of the system from the land, and, for the sake of consistency and uniformity, he included in the Bill the whole subject. But he considered that the two subjects were not entirely identical, though no doubt they were analogous. But he was willing to consider in Committee any alterations or Amendments that might be made in this subject. The question of urban hypothec was not a vital part of the Bill, and he did not consider that any hon. Member who should vote for the second reading thereby pledged himself to the abolition of urban hypothec.

MR. BRUCE said, he should vote for the second reading of this Bill, reserving to himself, however, perfect right to deal in any manner with it that might seem fit when in Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL said, that all the Members for burghs, with the exception of one, had spoken in favour of retaining urban hypothec, and it seemed to him that the reason was not far to seek—it was that the very class who complained of the existence of this law in the country were the landlords in towns. His own constituents were of opinion that the same rule should be applied to the town and country. He regretted that they had not had the opinion of a Scotch tenant-farmer. All those who had spoken were landlords; and, without attributing to them any selfish motives, he could not but think that they were not likely to be very well informed as to the feelings of the tenants. He believed that on this question the tenants were on the one side, and the landlords on the other.

MR. FORDYCE said, that almost the whole of the tenantry in the very large county he had the honour to represent were opposed to this law; and last year he presented a Petition, signed by no fewer than 1,300 of them, to that effect. They regarded it as a relic of feudal times; they believed that it crippled the proper cultivation of the soil, and that it interfered with the good feeling which should exist between landlord and tenant.

MAJOR WALKER said, he believed that among the landlord class there was no strong hostility against modifying the law. They looked at the agitation against the Law of Hypothec as an hypothetical grievance, and they believed that, whether the law were modified or abrogated, they had the power to protect themselves. In that belief they were prepared to meet half-way, or more than half-way, any honest proposition which might be made for the modification of the law. He had only had time to cast a hasty glance over the Report of the Lords' Committee, and the whole of Scotland was in utter ignorance of the results of the inquiry. Surely, then, it would be most premature to pledge themselves to deal with the law, or any part of it, before they had made themselves acquainted with the most valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he was able to remember for half-a-century the county in which he dwelt; and the tenantry in the county—perhaps the most industrious in Scotland—had sprung into existence through the Law of Hypothec. Had it not been for this law those small farms would have been thrown into larger holdings, and the agriculture of Scotland would have remained very much in the position it was in sixty years ago. They had had to encounter the difficulties of a great war—the proprietors for the most part were without capital; and it was only the facilities which were afforded by the Law of Hypothec that enabled the tenants to cultivate their farms. The hon. Member (Mr. Campbell) had regretted that they had not had the opinion of a tenant-farmer in the course of the debate. But the hon. Member forgot that they had evidence taken before the Committee, the opinion of a most eminent tenant-farmer, the Member for West Aberdeenshire (Mr. M'Combie), who stated that if the Law of Hypothec were abolished there would be much less competition for farms, and that they would get a more "respectable" class of tenants. But on being asked if the present tenants were not respectable, he explained that he meant men with more money in their pockets. They had also the evidence of Mr. Shepherd, one of the first breeders in Scotland, altogether in favour of maintaining the present law. In Aberdeenshire they were all breeders of cattle, and it was impossible for a man to sink in credit without its being apparent to his neighbours that he was going back; because his cattle decreased, and when these were going he received no credit from his manure merchant, or from anyone else. If a man in East Lothian fails—which was very rare, owing to their self-helpfulness—he went away, and his whole stock-in-trade consisted of a few sacks and a little manure. But no man could enter on a farm who had not got a stock of cattle, which was absolutely sufficient to secure his creditors and his landlord as well. He believed that the whole of this thing had been got up, first of all, as an electioneering cry; and, secondly, for the purpose of monopoly as respects the large farmers. Nobody could read the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords without being perfectly satisfied that such was the case.

SIR JOHN OGILVIE said, he had heard with great surprise the course the Lord Advocate said he intended to take in regard to this Bill. He said that he would vote for the second reading on condition that the hon. Member for Forfarshire would consent to certain modifications, which were very fully explained by the Lord Advocate in detail; and that unless his conditions were complied with he could not consent to the second reading. Now not only had the hon. Member not accepted the proposal of the Lord Advocate, but he had distinctly pledged himself not to entertain it, and announced his intention to bring this Bill again before us at the earliest possible period of the next Session. He could not, therefore, understand how the hon. and learned Lord Advocate could consistently support the second reading of this Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, it was unquestionably quite competent when a Bill was brought in for a certain object, with part of which hon. Members might agree, and with part of which they did not agree—it was in that case quite competent to the House to take the course of voting for the second reading. Now he expressed his opinion quite distinctly that he was against the total abolition of the Law of Hypothec, but that he thought its operation ought to be restricted to the point at which landlords in England were allowed to distrain; and he said that if his hon. Friend would go no further with this question, he was prepared to support the second reading out of respect to the strong opinions held by the country, and with a view to a modification of the law, in the sense he had mentioned. He must confess that his hon. Friend had not acceded to that proposal in the spirit in which he made it. He repeated he was entirely opposed to the total abolition of the Law of Hypothec, but he should vote for the second reading; but he gave his hon. Friend fair warning that if, next Session, he pursued the course he had declared, and which he was fully entitled to pursue, he (the Lord Advocate) would not feel bound again to give him the opportunity of having his Bill read a second time.

MR. AYTOUN thought it his duty as a burgh Member to declare that he should oppose any distinction being made between the rural districts and towns. He could not see that there was any difference in principle between rural districts and towns, and the limitation was simply urged, as he understood, upon the ground of the difference between the two in the amount of property at stake.

MR. COLLINS said, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, in promising to vote for the second reading of a Bill of which he disapproved, was only following the example set in "another place," and doubtless hoped to improve the Bill in Committee. If he should not succeed in doing that, the same result might happen in this case which had happened with regard to another measure.

MR. C. DALRYMPLE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary came into the House and adopted the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Lord Advocate; but he thought he could not be aware of the strong and convincing speech made by that right hon. and learned Gentleman against the Bill, or he would never have consented to vote for the second reading. He (Mr. Dalrymple) supposed the right hon. Gentleman would go into the same Lobby on the same understanding. But he wanted to know if the whole of Her Majesty's Government were going to do the same, with the same conviction, as was shown in the strong and very remarkable speech of their right hon. Colleague.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 127; Noes 91: Majority 36.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for this day month.

SPECIAL AND COMMON JURIES BILL.

(*Viscount Enfield, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Denman.*)

[BILL 175.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD, in moving *pro formâ* the second reading of this Bill, said, that its provisions were based upon the recommendations of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, submitted to and approved, with one exception, by the Judicature Commission.

The Bankruptcy Bill and other important measures had prevented the Law Officers of the Crown from taking charge of the Bill themselves, but the Attorney General, with great courtesy, had placed the draft in his hands. He accordingly proposed shortly to state the heads of the Bill, in order that they might be discussed during the Recess, and, he hoped, passed into law early next Session. The proposed qualification of householders to serve on common juries was in towns with 20,000 inhabitants and upwards, £50; and in towns with less than 20,000 inhabitants, £30. For special juries the qualification was to be the occupation of a dwelling house rated on not less than £100 value in the larger towns with the population already stated, or not less than £60 value in towns under that size; or else, in the case of a farm, a value of not less than £500. The qualification for jurors in Wales was to be assimilated to the qualification of England. Aliens, after ten years' domicile, were to be qualified to serve as jurors, and the trial *de medietate linguæ* was to be abolished. Some old exemptions from serving upon juries existing under local charters were to be done away with; and several great objections hitherto existing to the mode in which jury lists had been prepared would be removed. No juror would be summoned a second time until the whole list was exhausted. Jurors, in accordance with the recommendations of Sir William Erle, would be entitled to remuneration for their services at the rate of £1 1*s*. per day for special jurors, and 10*s*. for trying common jury cases. They would also be allowed fire and reasonable refreshment at their own expense. In addition to the points which he had stated the noble Viscount said there were various matters of detail which were dealt with in the clauses. He concluded by moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Viscount Enfield.*)

Mr. GRAVES said, he thought that the Bill was not drawn up with sufficient care. He objected to the clauses repealing the exemptions now enjoyed. Officers in the Volunteer and Naval Reserve Forces should be exempted from serving on juries.

Mr. A. W. YOUNG said, he approved of many of the enactments of the Bill, but he thought it required careful revision. He was of opinion that in some cases the jury might consist of a less number than twelve. In Australia the practice had long been to have juries of four to try civil cases, and the system worked satisfactorily. If a verdict of three-fourths of the number might be taken, after a certain period of deliberation, the result would be more satisfactory.

Mr. G. GREGORY said, he thought that suitors were entitled to have a common jury to try their cases as a matter of right, which they should not be called upon to pay for. If they chose to have their cases tried by a special jury, of course they must pay the extra expense thereby incurred themselves, but all common juries should be paid for by the State.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he thought common jurors should have some increase of pay over that which they at present received. It was very hard upon them that they who could the least afford it should be kept away from their business for three or four days at a time and only receive a mere trifle for their attendance.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE said, he hoped that the case of common jurors who tried criminal cases would not be lost sight of. Aldermen and town councillors ought to be exempted from serving on juries.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he hoped that the House would agree to the second reading of the Bill, although there was not much probability of its passing into law during the present Session. The Bill ably embodied the recommendations of the Judicature Commission, and was well worthy the attention of the House when it had time to attend to such matters. He thought the suggestion of the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) deserving of notice, and that nothing was more unfair than the working of the jury system with regard to criminal trials. According to the letter of the present law, every man properly qualified ought to be on the common jury list, and special jurors ought to be liable to serve on both juries. It was unfair that common jurors, who could least afford to lose their time, should be paid only at the rate of 8*d*. a cause, whilst grand jurors were allowed £1 1*s*. The intention of the law was fair enough. It meant that special jurors were to do double work, and therefore to receive double pay; but in practice special jurors were not taken out of the common jury list, but were placed in a special list, and did not serve on common juries. In Lancashire the law was properly carried into effect, and the jurors were generally of a very good class.

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought it impossible that a Bill of this kind could be properly dealt with by a private Member; the matter ought to be taken up by the Government. It was questionable whether the figure at which jurymen were taken should be increased. A great number of the people tried in the criminal courts were in a very humble class of life, and he did not think it fair that they should be tried by persons far above them in condition. There was nothing in the Bill to prevent a man who found a bill as a grand juror against a prisoner from trying him afterwards as a petty juror.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time; and *committed* for this day month.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

(*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Jacob Bright.*)

[BILL 122.] THIRD READING.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th July], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed*.

Mr. RAIKES said, he rose to move that the Bill be read a third time on that day three months. He had hoped his Amendment might have been rendered unnecessary by the withdrawal of the Bill, in order that a more satisfactory measure upon the subject might have been introduced in the course of the next Session. In dealing with a measure of this kind it was important that the House should look at its general tendency, and at the general policy of which it formed a part. He did not quarrel with the right hon. Gentleman who had introduced the Bill (Mr. Russell Gurney) for wishing to protect the property of married women against wasteful and rapacious husbands; but, in his opinion, that result might be obtained in a more satisfactory manner than that proposed in the Bill. He was aware that on the general question he should be met by these objections—firstly, that the measure would not operate as a step towards the establishment of that civil equality between men and women which was desired by some; secondly, that if this measure were rejected a large measure would be introduced next Session which would have that effect; and, thirdly, that the present measure would, to a certain extent, and also ought to have, the effect he so much deprecated. Now, in the first place, it would be for the House to consider whether the object of the measure might not be obtained in a much better way than that proposed by the Bill. The object of the right hon. Gentleman was to give to married women in the humbler classes of life a power that, he stated, was already enjoyed by their more fortunate sisters; but it appeared to him that this was precisely what the Bill would fail to effect. The system of marriage settlements had been greatly eulogized by those who supported the Bill; but those settlements were drawn up, not for the purpose of securing the property of the wife against her husband, but to secure the property of the children against the extravagance and recklessness of both the husband and the wife. The present Bill, however, aimed at something very different, and proposed to protect the property of the wife against her husband. The object of a marriage settlement was to prevent the wife from yielding to her feelings and handing over her property to her husband, whereas the Bill did not propose to protect her property from herself, and there was nothing in it to prevent her at any moment handing the whole of it over to her husband. This was a very important difference and one that should not be lightly overlooked. He thought that a scheme might be devised under which, where no actual marriage settlement had been executed, the law should assume that a common form of settlement had been made, under which the municipal authorities of the locality should become the trustees of the property of the wife for the benefit of the children, allowing the wife the benefit of the income derived from it during her life. This was a question that should be looked upon in a most jealous spirit, because it was a most important thing towards preserving the institution of marriage that the identity of interests between the parties and the control of the husband over the joint property should be maintained as far as possible, and only to deprive the husband of the control which properly belonged to him in cases where he had proved himself unworthy to exercise it. In this latter case he thought it would be sufficient to enable the wife, earning her own living, to go before a County Court Judge, who should have power, under certain circumstances, to grant her an order protecting her property as though she were a *feme sole*. Upon the argument that this Bill was not intended as a step in the direction of what was called the emancipation of women, he might say that the extension of the civil privileges of women was what was aimed at by many of those who supported the Bill. The hand that introduced the measure was the hand of the right hon. Gentleman, but the voice that spoke in every clause of it was that of a very different sort of social reformer. On Saturday last a meeting was held in London, at which a lady observed that this Bill was merely a step in the direction of the general enfranchisement of women. If that were so then the Bill aimed at destroying the mutual relations that had existed between men and women from time immemorial. To urge the acceptance of this measure on the ground that if it were rejected a larger one would be introduced was to appeal, not to their intelligence, but to their fear. The broad principle of the civil emancipation of women was too large a matter to be disposed of in a mere incidental way, and if brought forward at all it should be brought before the House as a substantial question by the Government. However much he might desire to improve the social position of women he did not think that the time had arrived when the country would be willing to see them placed upon a position of entire equality with men. The prospects of women would not be improved by their descending from the high position they now occupied in civilized life, and becoming the antagonists of men, and by their roughing it through life. Depend upon it if they did so they would meet the fate of the China vase which endeavoured to float down the stream with the brazen pot. It was for these reasons that he moved that the Bill be read the third time upon this day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Mr. JESSEL said, that the Bill contemplated no revolution so comprehensive as that sketched out by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Raikes). Its object was merely to preserve to married women the powers of contract and the rights which they possessed over their property before their marriage, and to prevent those rights being extinguished and absorbed by the superior rights of their husbands. The proposal to make the mayor and common councilmen trustees for the whole of the married women in their town was too preposterous for argument. The Bill was intended to protect the property of poor women in cases where it was too small to form the subject of a marriage settlement, and to enable such property to be used for the benefit of its owners, in place of being locked up in the hands of trustees until the death of the wife. The hon. and learned Member opposite appeared to think that women were such poor weak creatures that they were unable to protect themselves; but if he were to put himself in a position to test their capabilities in that respect he would probably learn a lesson that he would never forget for the rest of his life. Even if they could not under this Bill protect themselves against their husbands, they would be in no worse position than they were now. The hon. and learned Member had talked a good deal about women not descending from their position to rough it in the world, but he forgot that those whose cases this Bill was intended to meet were compelled to rough it through the whole of their lives from absolute necessity.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that all the ingenuity of the hon. and learned Member for Dover (Mr. Jessel) had been unable to gloss over the fact that this was two Bills rolled into one, and that it was a measure vitally altering the most important of all social relations. One object—in the object of which both sides agreed—was to protect the earnings of poor women, and the other was to alter the laws of settlement and inheritance in favour of opulent women. The hon. and learned Member had begun by arguing upon the second head, and had pretty conclusively shown how really revolutionary the measure was, when he seemed to have recollected that this method of argument was not the one most likely to recommend the Bill to the adoption of the House; so, after skilfully indulging in a little of that pleasant general talk in which he was a considerable proficient, he devoted himself to the poor woman's side of the matter. He (Mr. Beresford Hope) appealed to the House not to make so great a change on such insufficient evidence. The Bill had been inadequately debated on the second reading, and it then went up to a Select Committee, which must have been actuated by the demon of ambition, or else it would have divided the two subjects, and sent back a short Bill, which would, no doubt, have been unanimously passed, to protect the poor woman. As it was, the widest changes in important general principles had been assented to by that Committee by the narrowest majorities. Such was the measure that they were now called upon to consider, at past five o'clock on a Wednesday late in July. The House was like an exhausted receiver; they were now holding not a debate, but a mere conversation on the question. The front Bench on the Opposition side was absolutely empty, and not a Cabinet Minister was to be seen on the Treasury Bench. It was, therefore, hardly decent, under such circumstances, to attempt to push on a measure making so vital a change in all the relations of married life through every class of society. He hoped the House would not entertain the third reading, but would allow the matter to stand over till there was time during the next Session to give it a calm and full consideration.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 131; Noes 33: Majority 98.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 22nd July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—Bankruptcy* (207).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c.* (209); Dublin Freemen Commission* (210); Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks* (211); Married Women's Property* (212).

Second Reading—Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* (205); High Constables' Office Abolition, &c.* (99).

Committee—Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (180); Fines and Fees Collection* (155); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (183).

Committee—*Report*—Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland)* (175); Seamen's Clothing* (189); Queen Anne's Bounty (Superannuation Allowances)* (185).

Report—Bankruptcy* (154-208).

Third Reading—Municipal Franchise* (200); Charity Commissioners* (170); Special Bails* (166); Companies Clauses Act (1863) Amendment* (147); Poor Law Union Loans* (194); Sunday and Ragged Schools* (188), and *passed*.

IRISH CHURCH BILL—(No. 196.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS AND REASONS CONSIDERED.

Commons' amendments to Lords' amendments and Commons' reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords *further considered* (according to order).

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I stated on Tuesday night the reasons why I thought it necessary to ask your Lordships to adjourn the debate until I had had an opportunity of consulting with my Colleagues as to the course which ought to be pursued. Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the decision of your Lordships that night was one of a very grave character; but they have been unwilling to incur the responsibility of preventing your Lordships discussing the further Amendments which have been sent back by the House of Commons. My Lords, I can only say that I will endeavour to approach that discussion on the part of Her Majesty's Government, while adhering to the principles of the Bill, in a spirit of peace and conciliation. I not only hope, but I believe that we shall be met in a corresponding spirit by noble Lords on different sides of the House. My Lords, my first duty is to propose that this House will not insist on your Amendment substituting the 1st of May as the date of disestablishment, instead of the 1st of January, which the Government originally proposed. It was a matter of observation the other night that the fact of the House of Commons having insisted on this Amendment was a proof of want of conciliation on their part; and that observation was repeated when I assented to the remark of the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns), that the alteration was not very material. Now I venture to remind your Lordships that this is a point of the Bill on which the House had not a very decided opinion. In the first place, when it was proposed by the most rev. Primate, I stated what appeared to me to be a strong objection to deferring for one year more the operation of this portion of the measure. I think your Lordships will admit that, although you have shown singular personal indulgence to me, which I feel the more sensibly since I believe you were, in some degree—at all events in your individual capacities—actuated by a sympathy for "unavoidable suffering and calamity," yet that with regard to the suggestions which I made on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, they were not very much attended to by your Lordships. I do not think however, considering the feelings your Lordships entertained when the Bill was introduced, that such a course was perfectly unreasonable on your part. The Amendment of the most rev. Primate was carried by a considerable majority. I did not endeavour to reverse that decision during the early stages of the Bill; but I found that there was such a general feeling of doubt, to say the least, as to the expediency of this particular date, that I made an appeal to the most rev. Primate and to a right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Peterborough), who has shown such a thorough acquaintance with the subject of the Irish Church, the latter responded by expressing a decided opinion that it was desirable to retain the date proposed by Her Majesty's Government, This appeared so much to be the feeling of the House that a noble Earl on the opposite side of the House (the Earl of Carnarvon) moved the restoration of the original date. Thereupon the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) proposed a compromise, which was accepted at once without any discussion, based very much on a practical reason—for, on examination, it has been found that his proposal, having reference to the time when the rent-charge is paid, would not affect the position of the clergy on the day when, according to the proposition of Her Majesty's Government, the Bill would come into operation. Her Majesty's Government put themselves into communication with the Irish Church, it being entirely a matter for the Church itself to consider, and they found that the most active members of that Church wish the Bill, if passed, to take effect as speedily as possible. We have, therefore, thought it better that your Lordships should have one more opportunity of considering the matter. I now move that, in Clause 2, your Lordships do not insist on the substitution of May for January; but if the feeling of the House should be strongly against the restoration, I shall not only not divide the House but shall withdraw the Motion.

Moved, in Clause 2, not to *insist* on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed.—(*Earl Granville.*)

Lord CAIRNS: I trust your Lordships will allow me to say somewhat more than what relates to the precise Motion which the noble Earl has made. On a former occasion the noble Earl threw himself on your Lordships' indulgence; and though it may be a somewhat strange thing wherewith to begin what I have to say, I must also on this occasion throw myself on your Lordships' indulgence. I do so for this reason. Since the adjournment of the House on Tuesday night I have had an opportunity of conferring with the noble Earl opposite, and it appeared to him as it appears to me, that it was better that I should state to your Lordships exactly what has occurred between us. I throw myself especially on the indulgence of many noble Lords who have honoured me with their confidence, and of those noble Lords who have more than once in regard to this Bill acted in unison with us. I should have been glad, had it been possible — but it was not possible, to have held more conference with them before making any public statement on the subject to which I am about to refer. My Lords, it was clear to me that after the vote of Tuesday night the questions which remained to be discussed upon the Amendments to this Bill were not many in number, and that they were questions by no means incapable of solution. My Lords, I was glad to find that a similar spirit actuated the noble Earl opposite; and I have felt —what I am sure every one must have felt—that, whatever we might think of the principle of this measure, nothing could be more culpable on the part of either side of the House than to encourage or promote controversy on the details of a measure of this kind, where the materials for the solution of the controversy were at hand. It was in that view and with those sentiments that any communication which has occurred in conference between the noble Earl and myself was conducted. I agree with him that the Amendment to which he has now referred is of very secondary importance. Not only so—it has always appeared to me that if one of the most important provisions of the Bill—that with regard to commutation—were placed on a satisfactory and intelligible basis, the result would be that, for the purpose of that commutation, as well as for many other reasons, the earlier the day named for the disestablishment of the Church, supposing it to be disestablished, the better. As far therefore as that Amendment is concerned, I own that, for my own part, I am quite ready to accept the date of the 1st of January, 1871, if the noble Earl proposes that we should not insist upon our Amendment which fixes the 1st of May. I now come to an Amendment which I have before described, and would still describe, as one of great consequence—the Amendment proposed by my noble Friend below the Gangway (the Marquess of Salisbury) with regard to the relative position of rectors and curates. I took the liberty of stating to your Lordships on Tuesday night that the alteration made by the other House appeared to me to make the relative position of rectors and curates somewhat worse than before, for it provided that if an incumbent had, for the purpose of the ecclesiastical tax, made a return claiming a deduction for a curate in one previous year that curate was to be stamped for ever as a permanent curate, so as to become a permanent deduction from the income of the incumbent. I supposed a case, which was a very probable one, of a rector having employed a curate for a transitory or accidental purpose during one year, and having claimed a deduction in consequence of that employment. The sum paid to him would be claimed as a permanent deduction. Another provision in the clause, which was also referred to, suspended the annuity of a curate during a period of ill-health, and I believed the Government would not be unwilling to remove some part, at all events, of the objection which I entertained to the clause. I understand from the noble Earl that they would be willing in substance to provide that no curate should be stamped as a permanent one unless under two circumstances—first, unless he be adjudged a permanent curate after consideration of the various matters named in the original clause—namely length of service and the duties discharged to the benefice, and the non-residence, infirmity, or other incapacity of the incumbent, and his habit of employing a curate; and, secondly, unless he has returned the curate for the purpose of the ecclesiastical tax, not for one year, but for five years previously. I ought to mention, also, that I think this reference to the ecclesiastical tax, provided you carry it sufficiently far back, is a considerable advantage; for, as your Lordships may be aware, no living in Ireland is subject to deduction for that tax unless it amounts to upwards of £300 a year. The result of the proposal would be that with regard to livings under that sum there would be no deduction in respect of a curate, if there should happen to be one, from the income of the incumbent—and I believe we all agree that we should be especially anxious to afford the largest possible advantages to small incumbencies. As I have said, I have had a very insufficient opportunity of communicating with my noble Friends during the progress of my intercourse with the noble Earl opposite, but I trust that my noble Friend below the Gangway will not be unwilling to take the same view of the matter as myself—namely, that this is an offer on the part of the Government which we ought not to refuse, but ought rather to accept. My Lords, I now come to another Amendment, which I have before described as of very great consequence—indeed, I venture to regard it as the most important in the Bill—that of the noble Earl below the Gangway (the Earl of Carnarvon), dealing with the subject of commutation. Your Lordships will recollect generally that this Amendment proposes a commutation upon a scheme for the payment to the representative body of the Church of fourteen times the aggregate annual value of all the life interests of the Church. That scheme was objected to in the other House on this ground—it was said that in order to give effect to the scheme two things must occur. In the first place, if any incumbent, or any number of incumbents dissented from the commutation, there was an obligation on the Church Body to purchase a Government annuity or annuities for such dissentients; and it was said that if there should be, as no doubt there might be, a very large number of dissentients, that the new Church Body might find itself in considerable difficulty as to the means of obtaining money for the purpose of purchasing these Government annuities. It might indeed be said that the money could be obtained by means of the sum to be paid over to the Church Body for the compensations; but that sum is only payable in eight instalments, extending over a considerable space of time, and there is no doubt the Church Body might find itself in want of immediate funds for buying such annuities. Another objection was that, for the purpose of the whole operation, the Amendment required the consent of all the incumbrancers upon the incomes of any incumbents—which no doubt in words was the case—and that as some of the incumbrancers might dissent the whole scheme of commutation might be interrupted. Now, my Lords, admitting to a certain extent the weight of both these objections, I think a sufficient answer for the purpose of legislation is that the Church Body is willing to take the risk. They might lead to some difficulty in working out the arrangement, but if that difficulty could not be surmounted by the Church Body it would be that Body that would be injured, and not the funds which had formerly belonged to the Church. A proposal however was made in the House of Commons proceeding upon a totally different plan—a proposal for what I might call diocesan commutation, which was applicable also to Nonconformist bodies. If a certain portion — four-fifths being suggested — of the clergy of any diocese in Ireland assented to commutation, the Commissioners under this Bill were to pay to the Church Body not merely the tabulated value of the lives of the incumbents, but also a further sum of 7 per cent, which was to represent the value of the greater probability of duration in the case of clerical lives as compared with lives taken indiscriminately from any considerable population. Now, stopping there, I think the observation I made the other night was a fair one—that, in the first place, you have but small inducement to call upon four-fifths of the clergy of any diocese to assent to commutation, and in the next place, that the addition of 7 per cent was after all, nothing more than the bringing up the value of the annuities to what you admit to be their true and proper value. Then the observation was apparent, that if this scheme of commutation were to be undertaken—as it is most desirable it should be—on a large scale, and undertaken by the new Church Body, very large expenses would necessarily be incurred by that Body in the way of negotiation, in legal expenses, and in the various financial arrangements which would be necessary before you could persuade a large number of beneficed persons to come forward in a limited time and assent to the commutation. No provision, it was obvious, was made to cover that large margin of expenditure which was necessary on behalf of the Church Body. Now I have reason to believe on this head that Her Majesty's Goment are willing to propose to the other House that in the event of commutation in the different dioceses, by consent—not of four-fifths, but of three-fourths of the holders of preferments, there should be paid not merely the addition of 7 per cent but a further addition of 5 per cent, making 12 per cent in addition to what was originally proposed. Here again, I feel myself — and I hope my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) will forgive me if I have gone beyond my proper province in informing the representative of Her Majesty's Government that I thought the proposal was, upon the whole, a fair one for the Church, and that if it were one which the Government were prepared to support I did not think we ought to come to an issue with them in favour of the alternative proposal of my noble Friend. With this proposition, to which, as I understand, the Government are willing to accede, there is connected another—I mean the Amendment respecting residences. My Lords, as all schemes of commutation have hitherto stood, the result of accepting them would have been this—there would of necessity have been included in the commutation the value for their lives of the residences of the clergy and of any land occupied by them—for the principle of the Bill is to save to all life holders not merely their own interest in the tithe rent-charges, but their full interest in their residences and in lands belonging to those residences. Now, it has appeared to those who have considered this matter in the interest of the Church that it is likely to lead to great difficulty in the way of a general commutation, if it is made a condition of that commutation that there should be included in it not merely the interests of the incumbent in the tithe rent-charge, but also his life interest in his house and land; because if you did so he would be obliged to give up his house and land to the Commissioners, and would have only the chance or risk of getting them back through the medium of the new Church Body. Her Majesty's Government, as I understand, are willing to assent to a provision that if any incumbent desires it, there may be excepted out of his commutation his life interest in his residence and in any land which, on the 1st of January of the present year, was in his own occupation as appurtenant to that residence. Of course, if his land was let out to tenants, there would be no right to deduct it from the commutation, since he would get the full value for it by the commutation; but he may, if he pleases, except his residence and land in his own occupation, from the commutation, and become in that way the owner either of the whole of the commuted value, or of such part of it as he may agree with the representative of the Church Body—at the same time not being disturbed in his residence or in his occupation of such land during his life. That connects itself with the Amendment regarding residences, and it is the only mitigation of what I have throughout felt to be a very great hardship—a hardship much greater than the actual value of the property concerned in the proposal of the Government as regards residences — for I understand that the Government are not willing to make any concession as to the terms upon which they will give up the residences to the Church Body. They still desire that they should be dealt with in the manner originally proposed by the Bill—namely, by the payment, where there is no building charge, of a certain number of years' value of the site as land, and by the payment, where there is a building charge, of one or other of two sums mentioned in the Bill. I am not going to enter on debatable ground, but I have felt throughout that, both upon the merits of the case and on the pledges given by the Government in former years or months, the proposition contained in the Bill on this subject was one which I could not help thinking even to the last they would abandon. Her Majesty's Government take a different view, and the question which I have had to ask myself—I beg again your Lordships' indulgence for having taken upon myself without consultation with you to express an opinion on the subject—was this — The life enjoyment of the residences and land being provided for through the exception from the commutations wherever it is desired, would it be right that we should come to an issue upon a matter of this kind, involving, as I believe, a sum of not much over £100,000? I do not undervalue the question as divested of its financial aspect. I say again that I regard as one of the severest hardships of the Bill the way in which it deals with residences; but, at the same time, I am not prepared to advise your Lordships, upon an isolated point of this kind, supposing the other questions to be capable of a satisfactory solution, to push the matter to extremities. There remains one other matter only to which I will refer—for, of course, I will not trouble you upon mere technical points—the vote at which your Lordships arrived two nights ago, when you decided by a very large majority to strike out of the Preamble the statement that the property of the Church or its proceeds—

> "Should be held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion."

And also the statement that it was expedient—

> "That the said property or the proceeds thereof should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet so as not to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor."

The effect of your Lordships's vote was that the Preamble should run thus, that—

> "After satisfying so far as possible upon principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland all just and equitable claims, the property of the said Church of Ireland, or the proceeds thereof, should be applied in such manner as Parliament shall hereafter direct."

Now, the arguments on which your Lordships arrived at that conclusion were in substance these—First—and this weighed most with some—that a negative declaration was inoperative, unnecessary, and objectionable, and further that it was absolutely necessary with regard to any appropriation of this large sum of money that the absolute control of Parliament over it should be preserved until the occasion arose for its application. Now we shall by-and-by approach the 68th clause, which, when it first came up to us, provided for the application of the income, at all events, of the surplus, through the medium of Orders in Council and of the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland. A certain check was afterwards interposed by the House of Commons in a rather unusual manner on the efficacy of Orders in Council, requiring them to be laid on the table of the two Houses of Parliament, and providing that they should not take effect till a certain number of days after they had been so laid on the table. Her Majesty's Government, as I understand, now desire that in this clause your Lordships should introduce a statement to this effect—I am speaking from memory, but I believe I am tolerably accurate—that it is desirable that the surplus should be applied in the main to the relief of unavoidable calamity, but not so as to impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor, and that it should be so applied in such manner as Parliament shall hereafter direct. My Lords, I conceive that that is in substance in harmony with your Lordships' decision, and, for my part, I should not be prepared to offer any opposition to the introduction of these words into the 68th clause. My Lords, I have now gone through my statement. I end as I began. My strongest inducement to my conference with the noble Earl was my belief that the concessions which I have mentioned are such as this House, in a spirit of conciliation, would be disposed to entertain, and that, as far as I was concerned, and those with whom I act, they would be willing to entertain these concessions upon this footing. I trust that in this step I have not gone beyond what I was entitled to do in thinking that I had the support of those behind me. If I have I can only crave their indulgence, and ask them to consider the difficulty of the position in which I stood, and the short time there was for consultation with them. I will only add that, much as I object to this Bill, much—although I do not desire to use hard words—as I detest every part of it, I believe that if it is to pass it is not desirable for the public interests of this country, or for the particular interests of the Irish Church, that there should be a struggle prolonged for months upon minor details, if we are able to secure, as I think the suggestions I have made would secure, the most reasonable terms which the case admits of in favour of the Church of Ireland.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, as the author of one of the Amendments which have been rejected by the other House, it is right I should say one or two words as to my feelings with regard to this matter. I wish to state that in moving that Amendment I was solely actuated by the information given me that it was desired by the Irish Church that the date at which the Bill was to take effect should be deferred. When I found it was doubtful whether this was the case, and that there were probably as many unwilling that the date should be altered as those who wished it to be altered, I was of course quite willing to bow to the decision of the House on the matter. It is a question of little consequence, and I am therefore perfectly willing to agree to the restoration of the original date. My Lords, another Amendment was intrusted to me, which related to a far more important subject—namely, the private endowments of the Irish Church, and under the head of those private endowments the Ulster glebes. I was unfortunately absent on Tuesday evening, when an announcement was made to your Lordships that, upon the whole, it was the opinion of those who sit opposite that the House should not insist on its Amendment as to the Ulster glebes. I came down to the House to-night quite ready to insist upon it, had that been the wish of your Lordships, and am still ready to do so. At the same time, it is obvious from what has happened in the course of the various debates that there is a very grave question with regard to those Ulster glebes. It is obvious that we have the highest legal authority on the one hand as to their being private endowments, and the highest legal authority on the other side as to their being public endowments; and between the two it seems to be exactly one of those cases in which a compromise ought, if possible, to be accepted. Now it is true that in name no compromise has been offered; but I am free to admit that with regard to private endowments generally a very fair compromise was offered, and I accepted with the greatest satisfaction the proposal that £500,000 should be given down at once in payment of private endowments. Your Lordships were not slow to perceive that the payment of £500,000 at once, without waiting for the expiration of the various lives, raised that £500,000 to a sum of nearly £800,000. Now, as calculations had been made by the Prime Minister that these private endowments, even subsequent to 1670, were worth £500,000, it at first appeared to be no great concession, but merely the concession of the difference accruing from their payment at once, and their being postponed till the lives had expired—or some £300,000. On the other hand, however, it was contended by us that the Prime Minister had altogether miscalculated the value of these private endowments, and that they amounted to a much smaller sum than £500,000. When, therefore, the sum of £500,000 was offered, it was obvious that there had been a very great concession—not, indeed, sufficient to counterbalance the advantage which would have been derived from the retention of the Ulster glebes, but still one going a considerable way in that direction; and as I understand, from what passed early on Tuesday evening, that it was scarcely the intention of your Lordships to contend for the Ulster glebes, I could not help feeling that, upon the whole, we had made not a bad bargain by obtaining this £800,000 for private endowments. With regard to the other matters in dispute, it is very satisfactory to learn that they have been arranged, and that a proposal is to be made by Her Majesty's Government to conduct the commutation of life interests upon terms as satisfactory as those proposed by the noble Earl below the Gangway (the Earl of Carnarvon); so that the Irish Church will lose nothing by accepting the proposal of the Government to add 12 per cent, in addition to the commutation at some twelve years' purchase. The question of curates, so far as I could gather from the noble and learned Lord's statement, seems to have been arranged satisfactorily. There remains, therefore, only the question of the glebe houses. That is in the hands of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), and it is no business of mine to trespass upon that field. With regard to the Amendments which I have had to submit to your Lordships, I must express—not, indeed, my entire satisfaction, for I should have been very happy to have been the instrument of retaining the Ulster glebes—but my satisfaction that, on the whole, we have got as good terms as we could expect. My Lords, the noble Earl (Earl Granville), speaking on Tuesday night of some words I had used, said it was not necessary for me to have apologized for having come forward as the advocate of the mere pecuniary interests of the Irish Church, because, as he clearly saw, behind those pecuniary interests there were far higher interests which could not be maintained if those pecuniary interests were sacrificed ; yet it is impossible to conceal from oneself that the fact of having had to speak so much on matters connected merely with pecuniary interests does place us—especially those of us who occupy a position like mine —in a somewhat invidious position. I still regard the sacrifice of an Established Church in Ireland as a great misfortune. I hold as strongly as ever that the right policy for Ireland would have been to maintain the Established Church there in moderate proportions, and to give the people of Ireland the benefit which the sanction of religion by the State must confer upon a nation. To say anything more however on that point, would be to go back to the principle of the second reading of the Bill and to call in question the decision of the House. But when the Established Church was gone it still remained for us to consider whether we ought not to endeavour as much as possible to maintain an endowed Church; and I am thankful to believe that, by some means or other—in truth, not in name, because we are not allowed to mention such a thing as endowment—we shall be able to maintain an endowed Church of a very moderate character. These endowments, I grant, may be small, and the Church will have great difficulties to contend with; but I regard the possession of these endowments as a matter of great importance for the religious, social, and political well-being of Ireland. The evil of an unendowed clergy is confessed by all. I will not trouble your Lordships with statements as to that evil, but I will read one or two extracts which I trust at this time may not be without effect on any who are so infatuated as to desire that we should adopt the voluntary principle altogether in England as in Ireland. By the voluntary principle I mean the entire dependence of the clergy on the offerings of the people. I hold in my hand the opinion of a Roman Catholic priest on the effect of the voluntary system as carried out without endowments in Ireland itself, and his words are these—

> "Can it be said that the present state of clerical dependence for support upon a capricious multitude had no share in determining this unbecoming conduct on the part of the Irish Catholic priesthood? The multitude held the strings of the clerical purse, and woe betide the unfortunate priest who had set himself in opposition to their wishes. As a body they became all powerful in this respect. The common cry among them was that they would not uphold any priest who would not back them in their proceedings; and instances could be produced where this threat was carried into execution; and upright individuals of the clerical body were made the objects of every species of injustice and persecution."

All men who understand what the office of the clergy is greatly deplore the fact that when they are so stripped of all endowments they become the mere servants and tools of those whom they should teach. Whether, therefore, it is to be called endowment or not, I am thankful that, through some means or other, there is to be retained something which is to be placed in the hands of a Church Body for the benefit of the Church of Ireland to carry on its ministrations, independently of the offerings of the congregations. Lest I should be supposed to speak in any spirit of unkindness of the Roman Catholic priesthood in maintaining that doctrine, allow me to read a passage with regard to a totally different set of people. It comes from the *Life of Crabb Robinson*, a well known Dissenter—

> "I asked the landlord of an inn in Bohemia about the Hussites.' 'They are,' he replied, 'the most loyal and peaceable of all our people. In former days they were always breeding disturbances. Their priests were very poor and lived on the peasants, and so they went from house to house beggars and paupers.'"

The result was that, instead of teaching the people to live according to the laws of the land, and giving their whole time to their religious, social, and political improvement, even these inoffensive Hussite ministers were forced to become agitators and to forget the high mission which God had given them. Crabb Robinson goes on to say—

> "When the Emperor Joseph II. came to Prague to be crowned he issued a decree the first day that the Hussite priests should be allowed the same pay as the lowest order of the Catholic clergy, and since then we have never had a disturbance in the country."

Nothing, of course, is easier than to sneer at these poor Hussite priests because they dropped all their agitation as soon as they received any endowment; but after all human nature is human nature everywhere, and men who have to depend for their daily bread upon the passions of the people over whom they are set cannot well fulfil their high mission, whether they are tempted to appeal to the superstition or to the fanaticism of those amongst whom they are placed. I think, therefore, all experience proves that it is a great religious question whether or not the clergy shall be entirely dependent upon their flocks for their subsistence; and I am thankful to believe that if this Bill passes, according to what I am willing to say are the conciliatory proposals of the Government, though they may not be satisfactory to all, something will remain secured as a means of subsistence for the clergy of the disestablished Church of Ireland. It has been remarked in the course of these debates that the religion is not worth preserving which looks to the secular arm or the mere prop of pecuniary endowment for its maintenance. Now, our religion requires nothing of the kind;

but it is quite possible that if we should neglect opportunities of good which God has given us our religion may not be presented to the people in the purest form. I believe that evil will be averted in Ireland, partly, I trust, by the fact that some endowment will still be left for the clergy, and still more by the fact that the clergy who will first have to administer the concerns of that Church will have been brought up in a totally different system from the voluntary system. If they had had to start on this voluntary system I should have despaired for the religion, for the social improvement, and for the political security of the country; but bred as they have been in a totally different system, educated, trained in habits of intimacy with the clergy of the English Church, and commanding, as they do, even from a Roman Catholic Prelate, that tribute to their honour which has been more than once quoted "elsewhere," and which shows that they are quite unlike those fostered on the voluntary system, I believe they will be able, if any men can, to import into this Free Church something of that spirit which they have learnt in a nobler, higher, and far better system. I will conclude by reading the words in which that Roman Catholic Prelate bears his testimony to the Irish clergy, and which I trust will still remain characteristic of them, and distinguish them from all persons who live by pandering to the passions of the people—

> "In every relation of life the Protestant clergy who reside among us are not only blameless, but estimable and edifying. They are peaceful with all, and to their neighbours they are kind when they can; and we know that on many occasions they would be more active in beneficence, but that they do not wish to appear meddling, or incur the suspicion of tampering with poor Catholics. In bearing, in manners, and in dress, they become their state. If they are not learned theologians, they are accomplished scholars and polished gentlemen. There is little intercourse between them and us; but they cannot escape our observation, and sometimes when we noticed that quiet, and decorous, and modest course of life, we felt ourselves giving expression to the wish—*talis cum sis, utinam noster esses!*"

Here you have the testimony of an excellent Roman Catholic Prelate to the same great truth which was maintained by the great leader of the Free Church in Scotland, and I believe is maintained also by the best Dissenting ministers—that there is a spirit in the clergy of the Established Church which those who belong to Free Churches may well envy.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I will trespass but for a short time on the indulgence of the House. No one who remembers the slight part I have taken in the discussion of this Bill can doubt my earnest and sincere wish, if possible, to settle this most difficult question by some process of conciliation. I have had before now the misfortune of offending, in some degree, the feelings of many noble Friends with whom I have long acted, because I wished to push that conciliation to an extent which perhaps they thought was hardly justifiable, and I am satisfied, therefore' that you will not suppose that I am in any degree under-rating the value and importance of conciliation on such a question as this. I admit the difficulties as regards the critical and dangerous position of the Irish Church, and I admit the difficulties as regards the honour and consistency of this House—difficulties so great that they are a justification for the unusual course, as I am bound to regard it, of my noble and learned Friend who leads this side of the House. I fully admit that, if possible, some compromise should be arrived at. The only question is, what the terms of that compromise are, and whether they are—I will not say satisfactory in all respects, but as satisfactory as, under the circumstances of the case, we are justified in requiring them to be. I will not trouble your Lordships with any statement as to the Ulster glebes after what has fallen from the noble Earl on the other side. If my noble and learned Friend is content to waive that Amendment, I for one shall not urgently insist upon it. And with regard to the Amendments of my noble Friend the noble Marquess behind me (the Marquess of Salisbury), he is perfectly competent to explain to the House how far the proposed terms are satisfactory. My Lords, the alteration of the Amendment which I took charge of, and which was carried by a considerable majority of this House, has been explained by my noble and learned Friend. As I understand it, it amounts to this—that in lieu of the compulsory commutation which my Amendment carried with it, and in lieu of the fourteen years' purchase which that Amendment also gave to the value of a clerical life, the commutation shall occur when three-fourths of a diocese are agreed upon it, and it is to be at 7 per cent in the first instance, with an additional allowance of 5 per cent, calculated, as I understand it, as a margin upon the clerical lives, in order to cover the risks and contingencies of insurance. When my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns) stated this, he said he hardly knew what I should say to this alteration in the Amendment. I must really echo the words of my noble and learned Friend, and avow that I hardly know myself what to say to the alteration. On the one hand I cannot flatter myself that the 12 per cent is really a sufficient and complete substitute for the two years' additional purchase which my Amendment would have given, and I doubt very much whether the consent of three-fourths of the clergy of any diocese is really equivalent in value to a compulsory commutation such as I proposed. At the same time I feel bound to say that, as far as I understand the nature of the alteration which has been effected, it is probably, on the whole, more satisfactory than any which has been proposed on any other Amendment, and therefore I think it would be ungracious in me to hold out and refuse my assent to the terms which have been offered by the Government. With regard to the amended measure, as a whole, I can only say that I sincerely hope and trust it may be for the best. I have no desire except to advance the interests of the Irish Church, and if the Amendments as they are now proposed to be altered do, as a whole, secure to that Church some little competence out of the wreck of her fortunes, I, for one, shall rejoice. I own I cannot think that the altered Amendments are, as a whole, equivalent to the Amendments as they formerly stood; but I feel that in the position in which I and others are placed there is no alternative but to accept the Amendments as they are now proposed by Her Majesty's Government.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I confess, my Lords, I have listened to the statement of my noble and learned Friend with a feeling of very considerable embarrassment and some slight regret. I ventured the other night to say —and the noble Earl opposite objected to the statement—that the Irish Church Bill had been framed in a spirit of hard-fistedness that even Shylock might have envied; and having listened to the statement of my noble and learned Friend, I cannot help thinking that he has rather played the part of a gentle Antonio to a too exacting Shylock. I fear we have hardly received a full equivalent for those glebe houses, to which we were entitled on account, not merely of the original rights of the Church, but also of the distinct and unmistakable promises of Members of the present Government to their constituencies. Still I think that in a situation such as this great regard should be paid to the peculiar position in which my noble and learned Friend was placed. Whenever great differences of opinion divide the majority of one Assembly from the majority of another Assembly the fact involves the necessity that the questions in dispute shall not be fought out on the floor of the House but committed to plenipotentiaries who can decide them in the comparative freedom of a private room. And I feel that we ought to entertain the greatest sympathy for the position of my noble and learned Friend. It is all very well for us who have no responsibility in the matter to wish to fight somewhat further in behalf of our opinions, and to endeavour to obtain, as we thought we could, better terms for the Church which we love; but we must not forget that my noble and learned Friend who engaged in these negotiations had a tremendous responsibility on his shoulders. I do not speak merely of the constitutional situation. That is not a subject on which I should like to dwell, and considerations respecting it ought not, I think, to have much weight with an Assembly like this. But if the result of my noble and learned Friend refusing the terms which the Government has proposed had been that many months or years were wasted in the discussion of these details amid an atmosphere of political bitterness and sectarian animosities, it must, at least, have happened that many of the lives on which we depend for the value of the extra commutation afforded by the Government must have fallen in, and the Church of Ireland must in consequence have been very much poorer in the future. If the Government had adhered to the same terms, every year's delay would have made a considerable difference in the ultimate heritage of the Church of Ireland. Then there was the prospect of mischievous agitation and disturbances in Ireland, of the discredit attaching to a Church which would be charged with keeping up a struggle for the mere sake of obtaining more money, and the injury which must thereby arise to its future spiritual mission. I can well conceive that all these considerations must have pressed with overwhelming force on the mind of my noble and learned Friend. My own inclination would be to demand somewhat better terms, but I cannot dispute the discretion of him who knew the whole of the negotiation, which I do not. I am quite sure he has acted with an earnest desire to obtain the best terms for the Church to which he belongs far more closely than I do, and his zeal for which has always been well known. I feel that no good could arise to that Church if we, who are bound as much as we can to support him, were on this occasion to break away from his lead and refuse to accept the compromise he has conditionally assented to. The result of the conference leaves much to be lamented; but it is at least satisfactory to feel that the Irish Church will enter upon its new career without the addition of any further period of distracted and embittered controversy to turn its attention away from its high and lofty mission.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I rejoice to see the approaching termination of this great controversy, and I cannot but think that, notwithstanding all the calumny which has been poured upon us, the conduct of the House of Lords on the subject of the Irish Church does them the highest honour. It was obvious that the plan of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church could not be welcome to your Lordships, and yet your Lordships, acting in accordance with the opinion of the country, affirmed the principle of the measure by a considerable majority. I cannot but add that in Committee the most rev. the Primate of England, representing, as he did, the Church of England, and naturally having great sympathy with the Church of Ireland, behaved with the greatest moderation, and did not ask for anything unreasonable on behalf of the Church. There are two points which I cannot refrain from mentioning. One is that to which the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) has adverted—the question of the glebe houses for the clergy. For my part I should have been glad if those glebe houses could have been granted without any payment to the clergy of the Protestant Church. But if this boon had been granted solely to the Protestant clergy, it is obvious that the principle of equality would have been departed from, and therefore, when it had been determined that no clergy or ministers of any other Church should have residences, it was obvious that Parliament could not make such a grant to the clergy of the Protestant Church. The other point which I wish to mention relates to the Preamble and the 68th clause. With regard to the words of the 68th clause, as they will stand as the clause has been amended and accepted by the Government—that after all claims have been satisfied the surplus shall be applied to the relief of unavoidable suffering and calamity, in such a way as Parliament shall hereafter determine, I cannot think that these words have, in reality, any force. I cannot suppose that, after many years have elapsed, and it is found that there is a considerable surplus, Parliament will not be at liberty to see whether there are any objects likely to be of advantage to Ireland which have superior claims to those of "unavoidable calamity or suffering," and to decide freely in what manner that surplus shall be applied. On the whole, I look upon this as a most just and beneficial measure, and I rejoice that after three centuries of injustice to Ireland we have reached the century of reparation for that unhappy country.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND: My Lords, in the main purpose of this Bill I have throughout agreed with Her Majesty's Government, although on some points I have entertained a different opinion from theirs. The Preamble, as altered by your Lordships, is, I understand from the explanation given to us to-night, agreed to by the Government; and I gathered from the remarks of my noble Friend and from those of the noble and learned Lord opposite—who did not appear to me to be quite explicit on the point—that something is to be introduced into the 68th clause which entirely confines the future disposition of the surplus, as far, at least, as one Parliament can bind another on such a matter. I hope the noble and learned Lord—whose speech was in all other respects so admirably clear, and who seems to have adopted so conciliatory a course, and one for which this House, I think, is much indebted to him—I hope when we arive at the 68th clause we shall hear from the noble and learned Lord an explanation of the precise nature of the alteration which it is proposed to make in it. I do not now desire to revive the controversy as to the question of what has been called concurrent endowment. I think, after all that has occurred, that this would be a most inopportune moment for doing so. I thought, however, that the Preamble was originally framed in a manner that was highly objectionable, and it has been said that it was drawn with a view, to exclude the possibility of concurrent endowment. I should therefore like to know what are the precise words which the noble and learned Lord intends, in conjunction with the Government, to introduce into the 68th clause—if, indeed, he has entered into any engagement on that subject.

The Earl of MALMESBURY: My Lords, I must say, on my own part, that often as I have congratulated myself during this Session on having abdicated the responsible position which I lately held in this House in connection with the great Conservative party, I do so this evening more than ever when I consider the line taken by my noble and learned Friend, who, with his judicial mind and his great abilities, has effected what, I venture to think, perhaps no other noble lord on this side of the House could have succeeded in doing. My Lords, we ought all to be grateful to him for the manner in which he appears to have carried on this important negotiation. Nor would I be stingy in the expression of my gratitude, but I would extend that feeling to Her Majesty's Government for coming forward at this moment, ready to meet my noble and learned Friend in a fair spirit. When matters had arrived at the critical point which they had attained, I think it would have been a scandal, not only to this House, but to the whole country, if a compromise could not have been effected on the subject between the two Houses of Parliament. My Lords, after the division upon the second reading, in which the Conservative party were defeated in this House, the House of Lords admitted the principles of this Bill. Whether it be a good or a bad Bill, they admitted the principles of disestablishment and disendowment; and I say that, after the many debates which have followed the adoption of those principles, it would have been most inexcusable—most shameful, I think—in reference both to the Parliament and to the country, if we had been unable to arrive at some settlement on points of detail. I congratulate your Lordships, therefore, on the settlement which has apparently been come to; and if the terms of that settlement are not altogether satisfactory to this side of the House—and, probably, no such negotiation can ever be carried out in a way that shall be perfectly satisfactory to either party—yet, I must congratulate your Lordships on having reached a point, which, bad as I think this Bill is in its principle and also in its details, will make it less baneful to the country which Her Majesty's Government, no doubt, believe it will benefit. I think, my Lords, that this House has hitherto conducted this great controversy throughout with a due regard to the duty which it has to perform. Without too rigidly insisting on the personal opinions of its Members, it has shown that it holds itself to be still an independent element of the State. That it has acted independently, honestly, and fairly, has been evinced by the great mixture of political opinions which the divisions which have taken place have exhibited. The discussions and divisions on various points of detail, prove that this has not been treated by your Lordships merely as a party question, but one on which individual Peers have spoken and voted according to their conscientious views of its merits. I think we may, therefore, look with indifference upon the criticisms of those who charge us with failing to do our duty. We may also disregard the language of those who say that the House of Lords must do this and must do that because the whole nation is against them. My Lords, I deny that the whole nation is against the House of Lords on this question. At least two-fifths of the House of Commons are opposed to this Bill, and as they represent, according to the spirit of the Constitution, two-fifths of the country, it is impossible to maintain, with any truth, that the opinion of the House of Lords on this measure is opposed by the whole nation. My Lords, I will not trespass any further on your attention, but simply congratulate you again on the prospect of terminating this great controversy.

EARL GREY: My Lords, I confess that I concur with my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) in not wishing to abandon the hope that when we come to the 68th clause, both sides of the House may agree that it is inexpedient to introduce words which can have no real effect. But, at the same time, I, for one, am not prepared—at all events, without the consent of all parties—to press for any alteration of that clause, as assented to by the noble and learned Lord behind me. But I rise now, merely for the purpose of expressing the great satisfaction with which I listened to the speech of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns). I rejoice to think that this great question is now settled, in a manner which—though I cannot say it is altogether satisfactory—though I cannot believe that it will prove so final and complete a settlement as might have been accomplished—though I fear it will leave behind for future years some difficult discussions and perplexing questions—though I feel all this, still I am, upon the whole, satisfied that a matter of so much difficulty and so much embarrassment—is likely to be settled in a manner which, at all events for the present, will relieve us from the difficulty in which we were involved. I must say that, in arriving at that settlement, great credit is due, both to the noble and learned Lord and also to Her Majesty's Government; and as what I said on a former evening gave great offence to the Friends of Her Majesty's Government, I am anxious to take this opportunity of saying that I think to-night they have made the best and a complete answer to the charge brought against them. When I look back to all the circumstances of the case, to the nature of the answer that was returned by the House of Commons on the advice of Her Majesty's Ministers to the Amendments which we had made in the Bill, and to the manner in which that decision was recommended to the other House, I think they have no right to be surprised that I, and many besides myself, should have believed that some, at all events, of Her Majesty's Ministers—I never believed it of my noble Friend the Leader of this House, or of any of my noble Friends near him—were not anxious for a settlement of this question without a triumph over this House. But I have the greatest satisfaction in declaring that, by the course they have now taken, they have completely dispelled all suspicion of that kind from my mind, and I have the greatest pleasure in thinking that they have acted in a manner that will promote the advantage of the country and the honour of both Houses of Parliament. I must be permitted to add one word more, and it is this—it is now thirty-four or thirty-five years since I first pressed on Parliament the opinion—which I have on various occasions since again and again insisted upon—that it was absolutely necessary, if we wished to restore tranquillity and prosperity to Ireland, to deal with this question of the Irish Church. It is, therefore, to me a matter of extreme satisfaction to find that this advice has been at length acted upon. But it is a satisfaction not altogether unqualified with regret, because I feel that, if only two or three years sooner, both parties would have looked at this question in a dispassionate spirit. They might have arrived at a more satisfactory settlement, and the Church and the country might have been left in a better position.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, there have been so many noble Lords who are opposed to Her Majesty's Government, who on the present occasion have expressed their satisfaction at the arrangement which has been come to, that I think it is only fair to my noble Friends below me that some one of those who, with a single exception, have supported them throughout the whole Bill, and who, on all other points, approve the Bill as it was introduced, should say—on the part I hope of others as well as myself—that we also are gratified with what we have heard, and that we are relieved from an anxiety which I confess I have felt, to a great extent, since the division of last Tuesday. I must also say I was struck by the conciliatory tone adopted by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) when perhaps some excitement and a little angry feeling might have been expected to remain in the minds of your Lordships, and I think he deserves every compliment which has been paid him from both sides of the House for having so materially, on a most difficult question, contributed to a decision with which, I may say generally, we are all perfectly satisfied. I am glad my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) has paid a just tribute to the conciliatory spirit which has been displayed by Her Majesty's Government, and has confessed that by their conduct to night they have removed all the grounds of suspicion to which he gave expression on a former occasion. I can cordially join in the congratulations which have been offered to your Lordships on the settlement of this great question. No question of this great importance can be settled without a compromise and without concessions on either side; and there is this great advantage in such a proceeding—that when both parties feel that they have had something to do with the final arrangements, they feel more bound than they otherwise would be to stand by and defend the settlement. I do not believe that any question of importance was ever yet satisfactorily settled except by means of concessions made by opposite sides, and the permanency of such a settlement is infinitely greater when it is made by the consent of both parties. I do not think it would contribute to the harmony which I am glad to see prevails to refer in any way to past events. I think that the terms proposed by Her Majesty's Government, and accepted by the noble and learned Lord opposite on the part of his Friends, are fair and equitable as between both parties, and I confess I should be very sorry if any question was raised on the 68th clause which might occasion any difference of opinion. When the matter has been so far settled, I do not think it would be wise to raise any further question upon it. I think, then, that it will contribute to the settlement of this question if we do not attempt to re-open the arrangements which has been come to with the consent of the Leaders of both parties. I entirely agree with what fell from the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury)—that after having gone so far it would have been a disgrace to Parliament if the question were suspended for another year. Nobody can say what agitation and excitement might have arisen within that time. It would also have been no slight matter to disappoint the hopes which have been raised among those in Ireland who looked to this Bill as a message of peace and conciliation. And if once this agitation had been raised no one can say to what extent it would have gone, or what other questions might have been drawn in. I am convinced that it is for the good of the Irish people, for the tranquillity of Ireland, and for the peace of the Empire, that this question should have been speedily settled.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: My Lords, having taken the responsibility of urging upon your Lordships when this Bill was brought before you for second reading to reject it altogether, and not allow it to proceed to Committee, I feel that perhaps it is not amiss that I should, for a few moments, trespass on your Lordships' attention in reviewing the position in which we are now placed. My Lords, I confess that, under the circumstances, I believe my noble and learned Friend has done the best. I say under the circumstances; I wish I could add that much has been really gained for the Church. All that has been gained is confined to one single point. The 5 per cent added to the 7 per cent is the whole of the boon. Everything beyond that is only what the Protestant Church had a right to, and was promised, not only by Her Majesty's Government, but by Mr. O'Connell, by Mr. Miall, and by many Members of the Government in various places throughout the country and within these walls, and by many Members of the Lower House when they appealed to the constituencies on the hustings. Therefore it cannot be said the Church has gained much by our labours. But this House has gained something by the deference it has shown to public opinion—although I cannot help feeling that our deference to that opinion has been too great, because I have a strong conviction that the public opinion, most strongly expressed at this moment, is not that of the electors of the most populous districts, who I firmly believe are not in favour of this Bill. Still, we have shown by our endeavours to do what our convictions urged us to accomplish, that an hereditary branch of the Legislature has a vigour, an individuality, and an independence which do not belong to a representative body; and we have shown that, even although our conclusions may not be approved by the country at large, some will applaud them, and the whole country must admit that we have acted disinterestedly. My

Lords, we are now told we may look for happier times; God grant we may not look in vain! But I believe few Irishmen can very heartily join in the hope that has been expressed. With one party rendered dissatisfied, and the other not satisfied, I cannot but believe that the interests of Ireland have been sacrificed—not to Irish wishes or Irish feeling, but to the impulse of Englishmen bent on gratifying English notions. I congratulate the noble and learned Lord behind me in having brought this matter to an end. I wish I could offer an unqualified congratulation to the country at large on the measure before us.

LORD ATHLUMNEY said, he had not opposed Her Majesty's Government from any feeling of hostility to their policy—he thought that in pursuing the course he had he should have been assisting them; and he deeply regretted that what he believed would have been a message of peace to Ireland, the giving of residences to the priests, had not been adopted. Those of their Lordships who did not reside in Ireland did not know what it was to live in a country distracted by religious dissensions, and he hoped that by passing this Bill they had provided for peace and conciliation. He regretted that the course he had recommended had not been followed; but the only course now open to their Lordships was to accept the measure as it had been offered to them by the Government, on the basis of the compromise made by the noble and learned Lord opposite and the noble Earl below him, who had conducted their proceedings upon this occasion with so much ability. The day had evidently come when Protestant ascendancy could no longer be maintained in peace; he firmly believed that ascendancy was not worth the price the Church was paying for it, and that the future would see the disestablished Church re-established on the firm basis of the hearts of the people. He thought the result of their present legislation would be that the Roman Catholics would see that they might look for justice to the united Parliament; and he believed the Protestants would soon be of opinion that the position they had held was not worth the keeping.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Considering the confidential position in which I have been placed with reference to my noble and learned Friend behind me (Lord Cairns), I cannot allow the present debate to close without expressing my thanks to him for the manner in which he has conducted the negotiations with Her Majesty's Government. My Lords, I could not but feel that the vote to which I was very glad your Lordships came the night before last, and for which I was to some extent responsible, has placed the question in a most critical position; it was evident that this measure was in the very throes of its birth or the throes of its dissolution—and I cannot but feel thankful that the Government has taken what I conceive to be the wiser course, and has not allowed the possible irritation of that moment to induce them to adopt a course which might have been fruitful of the very worst consequences. But I must say that if the Government had thought it consistent with their duty to throw up the measure in consequence of that vote, the responsibility would have rested with them and not with your Lordships. My Lords, if one thing is clearer than another it is this—your Lordships passed the second reading of a measure, which it is notorious a great majority of your Lordships did not believe to be advantageous. Your Lordships do not approve the destruction of a Church which has been established in Ireland for the last 300 years. I venture to say that the great majority of your Lordships do not approve of this. But your Lordships felt that a decision had been pronounced by the country, and you only recognized a constitutional position by yielding to the decision of the country expressed by the constituencies. I will go further, and say that your Lordships have done more than yield to the opinion of the country. This question, as originally submitted to the country, involved only disestablishment and partial disendowment; but as time has passed on the demand upon us has grown—*Vires acquirit eundo*—and your Lordships have been asked to sanction, not partial, but total disendowment. Your Lordships have yielded that also, with exceptions so slight as to be hardly appreciable; but you have done it with credit to yourselves as a deliberative Assembly. We, on our side, have washed our hands of responsibility; we have protested against the provisions of the Bill; we have contended that the modifications which were suggested by the right rev. Primate who judiciously presides over the Province of Canterbury might have been introduced; and we have maintained that the Church of Ireland, which has been so beneficial to that country, might have been maintained there side by side with other religions in that country. The responsibility of this act is not upon ourselves; it is upon Her Majesty's Government; and I believe that responsibility is one of no ordinary magnitude. I do not believe that this measure will answer the expectations of its friends. There are clouds arising; there are other questions which are pressing; Irishmen will not be satisfied with this measure, but they will regard your weakness to resist their demands as a justification for urging other demands in the future. Viewing the gravity of this crisis, and viewing the consequences which would have resulted had the measure been again relegated to the public opinion of this country and of Ireland, I, for one, am gratified at the result which has transpired, and I tender to my noble and learned Friend my thanks for the judicious manner in which he has carried on these negotiations.

EARL STANHOPE: My Lords, considering the decision of the constituencies at the last General Election, and the agitation which would have arisen had this measure been rejected—considering also the improved shape which the Bill has at last assumed—much as I dislike this Bill, I do not hesitate to say I should have regarded the loss of it, under such circumstances, as a public misfortune. It would have been no benefit to the country to have remitted the question to it again. Among other evils, agitation would have re-commenced, and the Church of Ireland would probably have been placed in a worse position than that which, under the present Bill, it holds. Therefore I am disposed to join the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) in thanking the noble and learned Lord for the courage he has shown in taking upon himself the responsibility of acceding to the terms proposed. It does require courage to take upon one's self such a responsibility without any opportunity of consulting the party by whom one is supported. Great praise is also due to the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies (Earl Granville), who, placed as he has been in such trying circumstances, has not been diverted from the conciliatory temper for which he is so distinguished. Nor will I deny a share of praise upon this question to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I do not think it desirable to re-open the question of the several Amendments. Considering that in the other House there was an utter absence of support for the clause which stood in my name, and which was carried in this House, I do not think I should have been entitled to ask your Lordships to adhere to it; and that is the opinion of other noble Lords who supported me. I have heard, however, that at a private meeting of Irish Members of Parliament a very strong opinion was expressed as to the substantial merits of this clause, and it was felt that, but for other reasons, such as attachment to the Government which introduced the Bill and an implied compact with the Nonconformists, the clause might well have been supported on its merits. I think your Lordships have reason to be satisfied that you adopted that clause and sent it to the other House, for your acceptance of it showed that you are animated by a liberal spirit towards all the religious denominations of Ireland. The adoption of that clause did honour to the independence of this House; and therefore, in urging your Lordships to adopt it, I feel I gave you no advice of which I have reason to be ashamed. I rejoice that we have arrived at a settlement of this controversy upon moderate terms; and I shall most cordially rejoice if our apprehensions with regard to the operation of this Bill are not fulfilled. At all events, if it become law, it is our duty to do our utmost to make it work well.

LORD LYVEDEN: I must join in acknowledging the intellectual ability and the good temper displayed by the noble Lords by whom the terms of this compromise have been arranged; but no one has said a word for the advocates of what is called concurrent endowment. The provision for it went down to the House of Commons, but nobody took any notice of it. To my mind that measure was merely an act of grace to the Catholics of Ireland; it was by no means concurrent endowment. For thirty-five years it has been an article in the Liberal creed that the Church of Ireland should be disestablished; we expected the hour and the man; the hour came, and disestablishment takes place; but the man who carries it does not go the length other statesmen would have done for the last thirty-five or the last sixty-five years, by giving some endowment to the Roman Catholics. Therefore, in that respect, I think the measure is a failure. I agree with what was said by the noble Earl in his letter to Mr. Fortescue, that the real mode of carrying peace to Ireland would have been to endow the Presbyterian religion, to endow the Roman Catholics, and to give one-eighth of the property of the present Church revenues to the Protestant Episcopal Church. I think that if something in the way of endowment had been proposed by Mr. Gladstone it might have gone down with the people, and it is the absence of endowment which will henceforth be the evil of Ireland. Mr. Pitt proposed it in 1800, but on that occasion his plan was thwarted by the unfortunate malady of his Sovereign. Mr. Gladstone has not attempted it now, though he might have done so had he not been thwarted by the fanaticism of the Scotch nation. The opportunity of carrying such a scheme has, of course, now passed away. My only object in rising is to ask for some explanation as to what is to be done with the 68th clause, and the mode in which the surplus is to be dealt with on the clause. In common with other Members of your Lordships' House, I desire to know whether the surplus is to be devoted to the charitable purposes defined in the Bill until Parliament provides some other mode of expending the money, or whether the subject is left entirely open for the decision of a future Parliament? In the latter case another Act of Parliament will, of course, be necessary, and it will be open to us, when that Act is proposed, to express our opinion upon the destination of the money. It certainly appears to me that the Government have thrown away this money because they were afraid of devoting it to any proper use. They could not apply it to education for fear it might involve questions of religion, and they could not apply it to public works for fear of jobbery. If they applied it to railways, in the same manner they are afraid of the adverse opinion of the people of England. I should, therefore, be glad to hear what is the exact understanding between the noble and learned Lord opposite and the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies as to the appropriation of the surplus, and it is for that reason, and that reason alone, that I trespass upon the attention of the House.

LORD CAIRNS: In answer to the question which has been addressed to me by the noble Lord who has just sat down, and by the noble Duke below the Gangway (the Duke of Cleveland), I may say that the proposition made to me by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) was that the 68th clause should read in this way—

> "And whereas it is further expedient that the proceeds of the said property should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor, be it further enacted that the said proceeds shall be so applied accordingly, in the manner Parliament shall hereinafter provide."

The interpretation which I then put, and which I still put, upon these words was that they contain a general abstract proposition by way of Preamble, which, while I cannot quite agree with it, appears to me to be innocuous coupled with what follows, which provides that not 1*s.* shall be expended until the consent of Parliament has been obtained. As I have risen, perhaps your Lordships will permit me to say a word or two on one other matter, although not actually concerning the precise portion of the Bill now before us. My noble Friend who sits near me (the Earl of Devon), on the third reading of the Bill, induced your Lordships to depart from an Amendment to which you had agreed in Committee, by which their seats in this House were secured for the lifetime of the present holders to the right rev. Prelates who represent the Church Establishment in Ireland in the rotation to which they were respectively entitled. I said at the time that the proposal, as it appeared to me, was not one to which we ought to agree unless the right rev. Prelates themselves expressed a willingness to relinquish their seats in this House. Some time before that Motion was made, I had a communication made to me by my most rev. Friend who presides over the Province of Dublin, on behalf of himself and all the Irish Prelates, which I think it only due to them to mention. He stated to me on behalf of the Irish Prelates that they had no desire whatever to retain their seats in this House, or to make the retention of those seats a subject of struggle for their own sakes; or for any additional dignity or personal advantage that might be supposed to accrue to them for the retention of their seats in this House. But they said they looked upon this whole question as one which must, sooner or later, in the event of the Bill becoming law, be the subject of some arrangement, and they said that if concession on their sides could be made the ground of any benefit whatever being obtained by the Church to which they were so much attached, they were perfectly ready to make that concession, and would willingly make it in order to obtain any such benefit. Owing to the manner in which the Motion of my noble Friend was brought forward, it was, of course, impossible that any such consideration as that should be mentioned, and I was therefore unable to state that this was the desire and the wish of the right rev. Prelates, and it is only right that I should mention it now.

THE EARL OF FINGALL, on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, begged to offer his warmest and most heartfelt thanks to their Lordships for the decision to which they had come that evening. When the news of that night's proceedings reached Ireland cries of joy would ring from one end of the country to the other.

THE EARL OF BANDON desired that it should be known that he, at least, was no party to the compromise that had been proposed that evening, by which the Irish Church had been deprived of property which belonged to it by the prescription not of 300, but of more than 1000 years — of property which was guaranteed to it by the Magna Charta of Ireland — which was guaranteed to it at the time of the Reformation —which was guaranteed to it by the Act of Settlement and by the Act of Union. So far from agreeing with the noble Earl who had just sat down, his opinion was that when the telegrams conveyed to that country the news of the decision of that evening a deep and wide-spread feeling of sorrow would be occasioned amongst the Protestants of that country. What were they to gain by the compromise they had just heard of? He contended that they would gain literally nothing. Indeed, the only thing the Church of Ireland was alleged to have gained was the power of commuting. It was more than twenty-five years since he had first spoken in the House of Commons in defence of the Irish Church, and he was glad that he was still able to say a word—it might be for the last time—on its behalf in the hour in which so great a calamity was about to overtake it.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, perhaps I may be allowed to say in one word how singularly gratifying it has been to me to find by the speeches on every side of the House the entire absence of party spirit which has marked our proceedings to-night; and it is singularly gratifying to me also to hear the noble and learned Lord say that when he was good enough to ask to speak to me confidentially and with perfect frankness I met that proposal in the same spirit in which it was made. I need not say how glad I am to have this opportunity of bearing testimony not only to the perfect accuracy, but likewise to the remarkable clearness and succinctness with which he stated to the House what had passed at that interview. With regard to the suggestion of the most rev. Prelate that the proposal of 12 per cent came from Her Majesty's Government, I think it is only fair to us that the House should not be in any doubt on the subject. That was not a proposal made by us, but a proposal made by the noble and learned Lord; and though we have agreed to recommend it with all our power to the House of Commons we do so only as a concession to your Lordships' House, and as a means of arriving at a speedy settlement of this great and important question.

THE BISHOP OF TUAM: My Lords, as it does not seem probable that a division will be taken on the subject of this night's debate; and as therefore there may not be the opportunity of shewing one's opinion by a vote, I cannot remain silent, and thus appear to sanction what I so completely disapprove. I wish to free myself from all blame, or from the imputation of acquiescing in the turn which things have taken. I do not intend to occupy your Lordships' time for more than a few minutes, but I desire emphatically to protest against these proceedings, as explained to us by the noble Earl (Earl Granville) on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns). It is not a pleasant duty, when all seems so smooth, and arranged to mutual satisfaction, to rise and express unqualified dissent; still, in so doing, while compliments are passing between the two sides of the House, it is not my intention unnecessarily to use harsh words. First, I must say that I do not accept the terms of the agreement as consonant with the high principles on which we should be found acting, or as advantageous to the cause of the Irish Branch of the Established Church—soon, I now conclude, to be disestablished; on the contrary, I believe that in many respects the Irish Church has, by this agreement, received very bad and disadvantageous terms. Though I feel it right to say this, and acquit my conscience, I am quite aware that the agreement deals with mere matters of detail, comparatively worthless; and though I attended, and took part in every night's proceedings while we were in Committee, and did what lay in my power to prevent or mitigate the injurious action of this Bill, still I felt, and would wish again to declare, that everything which was worth defending had been given up when you passed the second reading of the Bill. With my present protest ends the duty which I have thus desired to fulfil as regards the Bill, affecting so injuriously as it does, the interests both of our Church and nation. It will become my duty, should the Bill pass into law, then to struggle in our altered condition for the best interests of our true religion, and I trust I shall not be wanting in zealous endeavours to render our Church as effective and useful as possible. But still, I enter my protest against every part and every enactment of this shameful Bill. I protest against what I regard as a national sin—the separation, I mean, of religion from the State—a national sin likely to draw upon us national calamity. I protest against the Bill, because it admits the principle that you have a right to touch property conveyed by solemn compacts for special purposes, which have been faithfully carried out. I protest against it, because it applies to secular purposes what has been dedicated to the service of Almighty God. I protest against it, because I believe it involves a violation of the Coronation Oath. I protest against it, because I believe it involves a violation of the Act of Settlement. I protest against it, because I believe it involves a violation of the Act of Union between England and Scotland; I protest against it, because I believe it involves a violation of the Act of Union between England and Ireland; solemn compacts in which national honour is, I believe, bound up. I protest against it, as doing grievous injustice to the laity of Ireland. I protest against it, as consigning to stereotyped poverty a large number of our best clergy with blighted prospects; and then, moreover, I protest against it, as a violation of the rights of property—draw what distinction you will between corporate and private property—still it invades these rights which are entwined through all our social system. This feature of your Bill is already bearing bitter fruit in Ireland; it is educating the people, by thus making light of the rights of the property of the Church, to anticipate a speedy and easy settlement of the land question according to their favourite views. You tell us that this Church Bill is to be a message of peace to Ireland, and to heal all its maladies. But what fruit has it as yet produced? Why, the few months during which you have been dealing with this measure have been marked with agrarian crimes, greater in extent, and more formidable in character than for many years. Nay, the fruit of your rash legislation has been this—to give confidence to the disaffected, and a sense of insecurity to those who are the bone and sinew of a nation's strength. Government such as this reverses the Scripture character of government, and becomes the praise of evil doers and the punishment of them that do well.

Motion, That the House do not insist upon the Amendment, *agreed to.*

Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences).

Moved, Not to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed.—(*Earl Granville.*)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN said, that he could not consent to the Commons' Amendment in this clause. The sum of money involved was very small, and at whatever inconvenience to the House, he must divide upon it.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that concessions had been made on both sides, that many noble Lords had left the House on the understanding that a settlement had been arrived at, and under these circumstances he trusted the most rev. Prelate would not divide the House.

The Earl of BANDON said, that the clergyman of the Free Church might be the only person in a parish who would have a difficulty in finding a house. If the houses were handed over free, as originally promised by the Prime Minister, it would involve a sum of only about £100,000. He hoped, therefore, the noble Earl opposite would not refuse to give the houses free of charge.

The Archbishop of DUBLIN said, it was only through ignorance of the rules of the House that he had not given warning of his intention to divide on this matter.

The Earl of COURTOWN, though cordially agreeing with the most rev. Prelate, hoped he would not divide the House.

Viscount DE VESCI said, it would put the House to great inconvenience if the most rev. Prelate should divide; and, as the noble Earl had stated, many noble Lords had left the House in the belief that there would be no divisions.

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL said, that those on the right rev. Bench could be no parties to the arrangement which had been made. He regretted extremely at all times to disturb the harmony of any assembly, but this was a very grave case, when the Primate representing the Irish Church in that House came down and found that arrangements had been made of which he could not be fully cognizant.

The Marquess of SALISBURY said, that he had the honour of being the author of the Amendment which had been so unceremoniously burked. But as the commander of the numerous forces on that side of the House had come to an arragement, he did not think there was anything else for himself to do but to yield. He did not like the arrangement, but the noble and learned Lord had acted for the best.

Viscount LIFFORD said, that the only question before the country at the late elections was that of disestablishment. The details of disendowment certainly were not before it, with the one single exception of these charges upon the glebe houses, and nobody disputed that these houses were to be delivered up free of charge. While anxious not to disturb the harmony of the House, which was like shaking hands after a quarrel, if the most rev. Prelate should go to a division he should feel bound to vote with him. He totally denied that this Bill would conciliate Ireland, or that it would establish religious equality in that country. It did not follow because the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian clergymen were not to receive glebe houses that therefore the Protestant clergyman should be deprived of his.

The Earl of LEITRIM thought the Bill dangerous in all its principles and all its branches, and it had been carried through the House by the help of statements totally unfounded. It was most desirable that these houses should be retained for the Protestant clergy. He was sure that this country would not give up its Protestant principles and that there would be a great re-action before long.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, after what had taken place, he thought it would be seen that a Parliamentary title was not a very secure one, and that a title by purchase would give little better security.

The Bishop of LICHFIELD said, he objected to the Bill on principle, but he was in the hands of the House. He could not but say that the Irish Church had been sacrificed.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:* — Contents 47; Not-Contents 17: Majority 30.

CONTENTS.

Hatherley, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Cleveland, D.
Marlborough, D.
Norfolk, D.

Normanby, M.

Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Devon, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Morley, E.
Nelson, E.
Shaftesbury, E.

Halifax, V.
Sydney, V.
Torrington, V.

Chester, Bp.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Cairns, L.
Camoys, L.
Carew, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)

Colville of Culross, L.
De Tabley, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Hylton, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lurgan, L.
Monson, L.
Northbrook, L.
Ponsonby L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Dublin, Archp.

Bandon, E.
Selkirk, E.

De Vesci, V.
Gough, V.
Lifford, V.

Derry and Raphoe, Bp.
Lichfield, Bp.
Tuam, &c., Bp.

Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*) [*Teller.*]
Colchester, L.
Denman, L
Northwick, L.
O'Neill, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]

PROTEST.

"*DISSENTIENT:*

"1. Because the usefulness of every clergyman in Ireland would be greatly impaired by the knowledge that he could have no legitimate successor in his parish and glebe house as of right.

"2. Because this Bill would *perpetuate* the divisions into sects of christians, which the appeal to an open Bible would tend to bring into unity under the supremacy of the Crown.

"3. Because the families of persons in holy orders would be deprived of that support which promotion on account of zeal and earnestness in duty has hitherto rewarded the clergy withal in their homes.

"4. Because the want of resident gentry being injurious to Ireland, the disturbance of a system which ensured a fair proportion of educated inhabitants would every year be more deeply felt if the clergy could not have houses free of charge.

"5. Because the equality proposed by this Bill would weaken the protest against such minor doctrines of the Church of Rome as tend to a reliance on form and on painful observances, and would divert attention from points which pious Catholics considered worthy of being conceded, and which the Queen Regent of France in 1561, in her instructions to be laid before the Pope, so far adopted as to write—'What danger can there be to the Church in removing images from the churches and doing away with certain useless forms in the administration of the Sacraments? It would be advantageous to allow all persons the Communion under both kinds; and to permit Divine worship to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue,' by Protestants.

"6. Because as sooner or later the continued opening of Churches in the Reformed Faith would bring all the inhabitants of Ireland into one Communion, and as the people of England desire their Irish Catholic brethren to enjoy all the advantages which they themselves possess as a National Church, it might well be considered at the great 'Œcumenical Council' how far changes should be deprecated subversive of all establishments and privileges.

"7. Because there can be no equality between the Romanists, Presbyterians, and (lawful) Episcopalians of Ireland if the endowments of the latter should be handed over to a paid commission, unless those denominations also permit their property to be confiscated, and because the petition from Killelagh to the House of Commons has been disregarded since 22nd June 1831 until now.

"8. Because the phrases 'Gifts of Churches' 'Re-establishment' and 'Re-endowment' apply to the case of lawful possession being invaded, of the disturbance of a position guaranteed by the Act of Union, and promulgated by a solemn invocation of The Deity in Wesminster Abbey, and to the revenues of the Irish Church, which are barely sufficient for the support of all the clergy, and of those who have at great cost been educated with the view of being candidates for Holy Orders.

"9. Because the Peers, being sworn to legislate 'according to law,' are invading the first principles of justice in consenting to this Bill, and removing blameless clergymen by commutation or otherwise.

"Denman."

Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus).

Then it was *moved,* "Not to insist on the Amendments in Clause 68, to which the Commons disagree, but to leave out the said clause, and to insert the following clause in lieu thereof:—

"And whereas it is further expedient that the proceeds of the said property should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor: Be it further enacted, that the said proceeds shall be so applied accordingly in the manner Parliament shall hereafter direct."

Earl GREY: I will not disturb the agreement which has been come to by both sides of the House by asking you to divide on this question; but I appeal to your Lordships not to lower the character of this House and of Parliament by inserting words which I cannot help thinking everyone of you must feel to be absolutely idle and futile, and incapable of answering any possible purpose. I should be equally averse to introducing words which will go absolutely for nothing whenever the subject is to be discussed. As far as the substance of the clause goes, it reserves to Parliament the future disposition of the property, and I have no fault to find with that; but it is unworthy of Parliament and of the dignity of this House to introduce into a clause a pledge which has absolutely no meaning, which will not fetter future Parliaments, and which is simply calculated to cover Parliament with ridicule. If these words be added to the clause I may say at once that whenever this subject comes up again to be dealt with I shall treat them as waste paper, and as not binding upon Parliament or any individual.

EARL GRANVILLE: I am sorry to deny the noble Earl the pleasure of having the last word, but I am bound to say I disagree with him. However, I will not trouble your Lordships with any arguments, as I believe the Amendment has the acquiescence of a majority your Lordships.

Motion *agreed to;* words inserted accordingly.

A Committee appointed to prepare reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on the said amendments: The Committee to meet *forthwith.*

Report from the Committee of the reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting upon certain of their amendments to which the Commons have disagreed; read and agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with amendments and reasons.

PRESENTATION OF BENEFICES BELONGING TO ROMAN CATHOLICS, &C. BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for repealing part of an Act of the first year of the reign of their Majesties King William and Queen Mary, intituled "An Act to vest in the Two Universities the Presentation of Benefices belonging to Papists, and for securing uniformity in the law relating to the residence of spiritual persons upon their Benefices, and to the penalties and forfeitures consequent on non-residence"—Was *presented* by The Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY; read 1ª. (No. 209.)

House adjourned at Ten o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 22nd July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class IV.
Resolutions [July 19 and 12] *reported.*
PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Accounts, &c. Presentation *.
Ordered—First Reading—Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment * [236].
First Reading—Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) * [237].
Second Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * [223]; Militia Pay * [82]; Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * [217]; Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment * [214]; Criminal Lunatics * [172]; Militia (Ireland) * [222].
Committee—Report—Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) * [216]; Railways Abandonment (*re-comm.*) * [219]; Heritable Rights * [204-234]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [182]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * [191]; Fisheries (Ireland) * [190]; Nitro Glycerine * [211-235].
Report—Telegraph * [197-233].
Third Reading—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2) [226]; Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds * [218]; Cinque Ports Act Amendment * [206], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Petroleum (*re-comm.*) * [194]; Poor Law (Scotland) Act (1845) Amendment * [80].

PARLIAMENT—MOSAICS IN THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, With whom the contract for the mosaics in the Central Lobby of the Houses of Parliament was made?

MR. LAYARD said, in reply, that he had nothing to do with the arrangements as to mere architectural ornaments. These were in the hands of Mr. Barry, who had hitherto employed Signor Salviati in the mosaic work. He believed that with regard to the large pictures no arrangement had yet been made.

IRELAND—12TH OF JULY IN CALEDON.

QUESTION.

MR. W. VERNER said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Government have any objection to state on whose application, and for what alleged reasons, a large extra force of Police were billeted in Caledon for the 12th of July; and, whether it is not the fact that the local magistracy had previously expressed a decided opinion that their services were not required?

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, in reply, that the Government had received an application from certain Roman Catholic inhabitants of the town of Caledon, asking for an increase in the police force on the then coming 12th of July. It was impossible for the Government to comply with all such applications, and no answer was returned to this; but it was referred to the resident magistrate, who was instructed to make arrangements for the preservation of the peace. The resident magistrate ordered a head constable and twenty additional constables to be sent there, and he (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) did not think the magistrate was wrong in taking that course, considering that this town contained a mixed population of 300 Roman Catholics and 800 Protestants, and that upon the 12th of July a large number of Orangemen, to the number of 3,000, marched through the town with forty drums and fifes. There was no breach of the peace; but, in his belief, the resident magistrate used a proper discretion in increasing the police force by this small number. As to any statement made by the local magistrates on the subject, he knew nothing of it.

INDIA—OPIUM TRADE.—QUESTION.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true that, in consequence of the Imperial Chinese Proclamation forbidding the cultivation of the poppy in China, it has been determined to increase the production of opium in the Bengal Presidency?

MR. GRANT DUFF said, in reply, it had been determined to increase the production of opium in the Bengal Presidency; but that determination was in no way connected with the Chinese Proclamation to which his hon. Friend alluded. The Government of India some time ago proposed to increase the growth of the poppy in Bengal with a view to obtaining a reserve of 10,000 chests of opium, and to offering for sale a fixed quantity of 48,000 chests in each year, exclusive of the opium sold to the retail traders. The object of the Government of India in proposing this was to steady prices, and to mitigate some, at least, of the uncertainties so embarrassing to the Indian financier which arose from fluctuations in the opium market. This proposal of the Government of India was sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council as far back as March last.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to ask, Whether the Correspondence on the subject will be laid on the Table before the Indian Financial Statement is introduced?

MR. GRANT DUFF made a gesture of assent.

TRAFFIC IN SOUTH SEA ISLANDERS.

QUESTION.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will state to the House what course Her Majesty's Government propose to take in regard to the acknowledged evils of the traffic in South Sea Islanders now in active operation in the Polynesian Archipelago?

MR. OTWAY said, in reply, that a communication was received at the Foreign Office in June, 1868, from the Convener of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, stating, on the authority of some missionaries at the New Hebrides, that a system of kidnapping natives was being carried on in vessels under the British, American, and French flags, and that even in the case of natives who went willingly the contracts made with them were not adhered to, and that they were detained for longer periods than they were hired for. The missionaries denounced this traffic as—

> "Being no better than slave-trading; alike injurious to those who are taken and those who are left. As those who are taken are of the strongest of the men, the remaining population is composed of the old and infirm, with the women and children; the women, moreover, on losing their husbands, take others, a course which," the missionaries observed, "produces complications and quarrels on the return of the emigrants."

Her Majesty's consuls and naval officers, who were directed to report on this matter, did not bear out the missionaries in their statements, but it was very probable that abuses did arise connected with this immigration; and at Lord Clarendon's suggestion, therefore, special instructions had been sent to the naval authorities on the station to watch over the operations in progress to procure immigrants, and to prevent anything like the slave trade in disguise. Her Majesty's Consul in the Polynesian Archipelago and in the Sandwich Islands would receive instructions in this sense also. He could assure his hon. Friend, and also the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird), who had been in communication with them on the subject, that it would not be neglected in the Foreign Office.

SOCIETE AGRICOLE ET INDUSTRIELLE D'EGYPTE.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHITE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to a Letter in the city article of "The Times" of July 8th, signed by the Chairman of the Committee of Shareholders of the Société Agricole et Industrielle d'Egypte; and, whether the statements therein contained are correct; and, if so, what steps Her Majesty's Government have taken, or are prepared to take, to obtain the fulfilment by the Viceroy of the engagements entered into by him with Her Majesty's Consul General in Egypt?

Mr. OTWAY said, in reply, that he did not think it would be convenient to discuss with the writer of that letter whether his statement was correct or not. He would, however, repeat to his hon. Friend the substance of the answer he gave the other day. The contention of the Government had always been that the British shareholders in that society were intitled to the same treatment as that which was meted to the foreign shareholders, and when they were informed that the Viceroy had settled on certain terms with the French shareholders, the Secretary of State had instructed Her Majesty's Consul General in Egypt to require that the British shareholders should have the same treatment. The Consul General, in answer to that instruction, informed them that the Viceroy intended that British shareholders should be placed in the same position as French shareholders. The Viceroy having purchased the shares held by two French firms, had consequently purchased those held by two English firms. We have not been informed that he had purchased the shares of all the French holders. Inquiries haue, however, been made on this point in Paris, as he should certainly contend that it was only just that British shareholders should be placed in exactly the same position as French.

UNIVERSITY TESTS BILL AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. SARTORIS said, he wished to ask Mr. Solicitor General, Whether, considering that the University Tests Bill will not become Law this Session, the Government would be prepared to include a more comprehensive scheme for the extension of our Universities in the general educational measure they intend to bring forward next year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL: In answer, Sir, to the Question of the hon. Gentleman, I need hardly remind the House that my position in relation to the Government is not such that I am able to speak very authoritatively on this matter. Whether the Cabinet has any intentions on this subject, and if so what those intentions may be, I really do not know, and I have not taken upon myself to inquire; but if the hon. Gentleman wishes for any expression of my opinion, I may perhaps be permitted to say that the entire rejection of the wishes of this House by the majority of the other House, in refusing even to consider a Bill which had been sent up after being passed through this House by very large majorities, has certainly freed me from the duty—and I may say has taken away from me the wish—of considering the feelings and prejudices in regard to this measure of the other House of Parliament. And I may add, that if the majority of the House of Lords are unaware that popular and just demands of this kind are in the nature of things—["Oh, oh!"]—

Viscount SANDON: I beg leave, Sir, to ask whether the hon. and learned Gentleman is in Order in commenting upon the conduct of the other House with regard to a Bill lately brought before it in answering a Question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule of this House is that we do not comment upon the debates in the other House, but the public acts of the House of Lords are open to comment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL: I was only going to say, Sir, when the noble Viscount interrupted me, that if the majority of the House of Lords are unaware that demands of this kind are in their nature certain to rise if met by contemptuous rejection, they are the only ninety-one persons in England who are so.

Mr. DISRAELI: I rise to Order, Sir. I wish to know whether, in answering a Question, an hon. Member may be allowed to debate a public matter? ["Oh, oh!"] I beg to state that I have no objection to the hon. and learned Gentleman having this opinion, and taking a proper mode of communicating it to the House; but if an opinion is expressed, and if we are to enter into controversy, it ought to be under circumstances which will allow an answer. Therefore, Sir, I beg to ask your opinion whether, in answering a Question, an hon. Member has a right to enter into an argument such as that which is now being conducted by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is desirable in answering a Question that as little of controversial matters as possible should be introduced into the answer.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.—QUESTION.

MR. DODDS said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the further evidence taken before the Royal Commission appointed in 1865 for inquiring into the Pollution of Rivers will be laid before the House during the present Session; if so, whether with or without any further Report; and when it is probable that the Commission will complete its labours?

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN replied that the Rivers Pollution Commission of 1865, having made three Reports, was dissolved in February 1868, and a new Commission appointed in the following April. That Commission would probably complete its first Report very shortly, but scarcely in time to be in the hands of Members during the present Session. This Report would be on the Mersey and Ribble basin, as a cotton manufacturing district, and on the Aire and Calder basin as a woollen manufacturing district. The Commissioners had still much work of an important character to proceed with, and it was not possible at that moment to fix any precise period at which it was probable that their labours would be terminated.

NAVY—COASTGUARDSMEN.
QUESTION.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, during the recent cruize of the Fleet in the Channel, it was true that certain Coastguardsmen, in the full enjoyment of health, and in the prime of life, are about to be discharged on pension, by direction of the Admiralty, because their back teeth are too far gone to masticate ship's biscuit; and whether, if this statement be correct, the Admiralty think that the pensioning off of able-bodied men, in the prime of life, simply for the loss of their back teeth, is the best way of making Her Majesty's Service attractive to our seafaring population?

MR. CHILDERS said, in reply to the noble Lord's inquiry, he had to say that, during the recent cruize of the Reserve Squadron, no coastguardsmen were ordered to be discharged, either from deficiency of back teeth or for any other reason, What he imagined the noble Lord alluded to was this. By the rules of the service, every coastguardsman, unable to serve efficiently at sea, was liable to be discharged; and, considering that the force was our principal reserve, this rule should be strictly enforced. On the occasion of the recent cruize, it was ascertained that some hundreds of coastguardsmen were probably unfit for sea service, and it was ordered that all above a certain age should be surveyed during this summer. One of the conditions for entering the service was that a man should not have lost "so many teeth as would materially interfere with mastication;" and as sailors had to eat hard ship biscuit, he was not prepared, as at present advised, to repeal this regulation. But he found only one case, in which the medical officers recommended that a coastguardsman should be discharged solely on this ground; and in that case the recommendation was sent back for re-consideration. In several cases, men had been pronounced "unfit for active service at sea, in consequence of injuries or diseases, coupled with loss of teeth," but not for loss of teeth only. In reply to the second part of the noble Lord's Question, he had to say that the naval service was most popular at the present time, in consequence of the high rate of pay and allowances, and especially the recent great increase in pensions; and he was not prepared to diminish its efficiency by refraining from giving those pensions to men pronounced unfit for service.

ARMY—FIELD DAYS AT ALDERSHOT DURING HOT WEATHER.— QUESTION.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is aware that on Monday the 12th instant the troops at Aldershot remained under arms from ten o'clock till between two and three p.m., and that in consequence of the extreme heat of the weather and the tightness of their clothing, the plain was literally strewn with men who had fallen out of the ranks in a fainting condition; whether he has any objection to state the number of men in each regiment who fell out upon that occasion; whether any, and if any, what directions have been given to the General Commanding at Aldershot as to the manifest expediency of ordering that field exercise of every description should take place early in the morning during hot weather, and whether it is not the fact that Regimental Medical Officers of the Army have reported that the health and comfort of the soldier would be greatly increased if the wearing of stocks were altogether discontinued?

Mr. CARDWELL: In consequence, Sir, of the Question put to me by my noble Friend I have made inquiries, and have received a Report from Aldershot, from which I find that there was a field day on Monday, the 12th, and the troops remained under arms from ten till two, and a portion of them till half-past two. From the heat of the weather many men—that is 125 out of 8,125—fell out—the greater part of them to obtain water from the water carts that were in attendance. That, however, was not to be attributed to the tightness of the clothing. It is not the case that the plain was literally strewn with men who had fallen out; but it is true that five men were sent to hospital. In no one of the cases have serious consequences followed, and all the men have since returned to their duties. No directions have been given by the Horse Guards to the Lieutenant General commanding at Aldershot, in whose discretion, assisted by the medical officers, the utmost confidence may be placed. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that there is no officer in whom greater confidence may be placed than in Lieutenant General Sir James Scarlett. As to the wearing of the stock, permission has been given to discontinue the wearing of the old one. The new tunic is in course of issue.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL: Will the right hon. Gentleman state the number of men sent into hospital between the 6th and 16th of July in consequence of the great heat on field days?

Mr. CARDWELL: I shall be happy to give the noble Lord that information if he wishes for it.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

AFFAIRS OF NEW ZEALAND.

OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount BURY, in rising to call the attention of the House to recent events in New Zealand, and to the Correspondence relative to New Zealand affairs which has lately been laid upon the Table of the House, said, it was not without considerable hesitation and long deliberation that he had decided on bringing the matter before the House, for he feared that in doing so he might provoke the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies to commit himself to a certain course of policy which, when the country was roused, as he believed it would be roused, he would be compelled to alter. But having communicated with the right hon. Gentleman he had found in him so great a sympathy with the colonists, that he was sure the most favourable construction would be placed by the right hon Gentleman on their demands. The state of affairs in that colony was very grave. The last mail had brought the news of fresh disasters. Settlements had been devastated, bodies of fanatics had attacked defenceless settlers, and horrors had occurred unsurpassed in atrocity in servile war or in the Indian Mutiny. We heard of infants eviscerated, and thrown palpitating and bleeding into their mother's laps; they heard of men being slain before the eyes of their wives, of their eyes being torn out and eaten; of women only reserved to pass through a period of horrible outrage, and then suffering death by torture. The colony of New Zealand had been under our rule for forty or fifty years, and the present was not a time to withdraw all protection from that country. The colonists did not ask for the assistance of our soldiers or for a gift of money, but the war which had subsisted for many long years had broken down their resources. In the Northern Island every man capable of bearing arms had been for many years past withdrawn from peaceful occupations. Settlements had been denuded of their male able-bodied population, and they now came to the Imperial Parliament, with their resources exhausted and with the number of men available for their defence seriously diminished, to request the guarantee of a loan of money, in order that they might raise troops to protect themselves. The colonists said, and their past conduct justified the utmost confidence that they would honourably and punctually re-pay all they might raise under Imperial guarantee. The despatch which had been recently sent by Earl Granville, in answer to that demand, was hardly one that might have been expected from a nobleman so pre-eminently distinguished for everything which could adorn the character of a statesman and a man. Considering all the circumstances of New Zealand, he did not think that this was the time to convey to the settlers that it mattered not to this country whether they were eaten up by the savages or not, and that they went out to the colony without any consent or sanction on the part of the British Government. The noble Earl could not have looked into the question for himself, but must have accepted the official traditions handed down by his predecessors. He said in his despatch—

> "A number of Englishmen, without any invitation or encouragement from the English Government, took on themselves to form one or more settlements in the islands of New Zealand. The Government of the day considered itself responsible for placing the relations between these British subjects and the natives among whom they settled on a reasonable basis, and for securing order among the settlers. It therefore acquired the islands by treaty from the natives, and established a regular Government in the settlements. The Government was amenable at first to the Home Government, afterwards almost wholly to the settlers. But it was never at any time attempted to make New Zealand tributary to Great Britain, or to direct local affairs in such a way as to produce any political or pecuniary advantage to this country. The colony was governed with a view to the real or supposed advantage of the inhabitants. In one part of the colony, New Plymouth, a great and not unnatural desire existed to acquire part of the neighbouring lands from the natives. The Governor, holding as an Imperial officer the position of protector of native rights, but also anxious to gratify the desires of the colonists, took a step satisfactory to his responsible advisers, to the local Legislature, and apparently to the mass of the colonists, though blamed by some as inconsistent with those duties to the natives which were in some sense Imperial. The result of this step, taken entirely in the interests and with the approval of the colonists, was a war carried on partly at the expense of New Zealand, but principally at the expense of this country. And the result of the war is that the leading tribe of the Maories is scattered; that the power of the others is broken, and that large tracts of land to which the Government had no claim, and the settlers no access, except by friendly arrangement with the natives, are confiscated, sold, and occupied by Europeans. If this statement is correct, it follows that the Imperial Government have not transferred to that of the colony any obligation whatever, except that imposed on all of us by natural justice, not to appropriate the property of others; and that all the Imperial expenditure on the colony has been for the benefit of the colonists."

As a matter of history he disputed many of these assertions, and even if they were true he maintained that it was injudicious, unwise, and unkind to use these expressions. It was often said that the colonization of New Zealand had been injurious to the natives, whom, in their intercourse with them, the colonists treated as the mere scum of the earth. It was also stated, and even in blue books, that it was owing to mismanagement and neglect on the part of the colonists that the Maories had been metamorphosed into rebels against our authority. It was, however, urged by the colonists, and he believed with truth, that the Home Government had from the first reserved to itself the control of native affairs, and that if they had been mismanaged it was the Home Government that was responsible. It was, he might add, the way in which the Maori lands were dealt with in the first instance that brought about the first Maori war. If that were so we had no right, when we found ourselves involved in a costly struggle, to say that, because our policy had resulted in disaster, we should hand over to the colonists the management of the native population. What, he would ask, was the history of the colonization of New Zealand? Soon after it was first discovered, runaway whalers, convicts from the neighbouring settlement of Australia, men flying from the law, settled among the natives, and married in many instances the daughters of the native chiefs. In process of time a settlement was formed at a place called Kokoraraika, in the northern part of the North Island. That settlement had gradually become developed into a perfect pandemonium, and had been described as a perfect Alsatia. Soon after missionaries were sent out from this country, who established themselves not far from Tokoraraki, and who endeavoured, not without success, to civilize the natives. They acquired a considerable degree of influence among them, purchased from them a large portion of their lands, and in process of time possessed the principal power, so far as Europeans were concerned, in New Zealand. These missionaries at the time thought of colonizing the entire country, but they desired that no other white persons should be sent out except such as were sent out under their authority. They therefore persuaded the Colonial Office to present some thirteen native chiefs with a flag, and to declare them the United Confederacy of the country, and this farce was actually gone through. As time went on the New Zealand Company was established in England, and they determined to get by fair cession from the natives land on which they might plant a settlement. They settled accordingly in the southern part of the North Island, and there established Wellington, which was now the capital. As soon as the missionaries found that there were other people settling on lands which they had reserved for themselves, they resolved that the new settlers should be got rid of, and they invented a very ingenious theory to secure that object. They said that they were the proprietors of the fee simple of the whole land of New Zealand; that no land could be acquired except by purchase from them, and that any one who purchased from a native must prove his title, which, of course, would involve the proving of the native title also. Just at that time the French desired to establish a settlement on the South Pacific, and they fixed on New Zealand for the purpose. When that intelligence reached England Captain Hobson was sent out and directed to negotiate with the thirteen New Zealand chiefs to whom he had referred, for the cession of their sovereignty, with the view to its being transferred to the Crown of this country. The result was the treaty of Waitangi, which had been described as the Magna Charter of the Maories, by which it was agreed that the Maories should be placed in full possession of all the land which they then held; that any one who settled on that land must purchase from the Maories, and that no one should be allowed to make such purchase except the Crown itself. 80,000 Maories—that was about the number on the island—were thereupon put in possession of some 80,000 acres of waste land, not one-hundredth part of which they had ever seen. In order to carry out the provisions of the treaty Commissioners were sent out and a native land court was established. The New Zealand Company had meantime acquired some 70,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Wellington, to which they had as good a title as the missionaries had to the land which they had obtained in the neighbourhood of Tokoraraki a few years before. But, owing to the suicidal policy of the missionaries in determining that they should be the only European holders of land, there was for the next few years nothing but disputes between the two European communities in the island—the missionaries and the New Zealand Society. The missionaries were supreme with the Colonial Office, and the New Zealand Company were informed that they must prove their title to the lands which they had purchased before what was called the native land court. The natives, of course, the moment they heard the land was theirs to sell, set up a number of claims. Claimants sprang up for the fee simple of every acre that had been purchased by the company, many of which had, he believed, not been settled to the present day. Such was the history of the land question in New Zealand. The difficulty had arisen from not keeping the land in the possession of the Crown, as in Canada, and establishing the principle that all purchases of land should be made from the Crown. Could any system be imagined more certain to produce land disputes. The claims of the natives were based chiefly on the fact of confiscation and conquest; and the accidental shedding of blood—even the cutting of a man's finger while on the land of another person—had been held in our own land court to be a good title against a European title by purchase. In the Southern Island, near Nelson, a chief said he owned certain land by right of conquest, and murdered the settlers who went out to survey it. In point of fact, he had never been within a hundred miles of the land, but he said his tribe had driven off another tribe, and that, therefore, the land was his; and the Governor actually decided that, although the Queen's magistrates had been slain, the Queen's writ defied, and foul murder committed, this chief had acted in the exercise of his just rights, and therefore must escape without punishment. This massacre was the first instance in which the natives felt that they might set the settlers at defiance, and from that time they had been petted, cosseted, and spoilt by the Home Government, and had come to believe that the settlers belonged to an inferior grade and were not true representatives of England, the missionaries taking pains to confirm them in that belief. Now the Maori theory of colonization was that the European settlers should not be numerous enough to command respect, but should remain in fear of them, should buy their slave girls, their peaches, and their pigs, and otherwise should not dare to call their souls their own; in return supplying the natives with such civilization and such arms as they wanted. The Maories never had any beneficial possession of the soil. They were not a hunting people, for the very good reason that there was not a single quadruped in New Zealand; they were not an agricultural people, for they had only to scratch the rich soil, and a crop came up sufficient to satisfy their simple wants. Living mainly upon fish and roots, it was only in time of war that they traversed the country, and to tell these people that they were lords of the soil was the first cardinal mistake made by this country in settling New Zealand. In 1853 it was determined that the settlers, who had possession of a fringe of land around the North Island should have responsible and constitutional government; and he contended that the policy of the Imperial Government having been at the root of the land difficulty, the responsibility rested with us at home, and we had no right to withdraw from our position and throw the onus upon the settlers. What were the instructions of Governor Brown? He kept the conduct of native affairs solely in his own hands, and the two departments of Secretary for Native Affairs and Chief Commissioner for the purchase of native land were combined and retained in the hands of the Governor's Secretary. That measure acted injuriously upon the native mind, presenting the Crown to them in the light of a land jobber craving after native land, and leading them to suppose that the Governor was only there to bicker with them about their land. Of course, we must now abide by the Treaty of Waitangi, and treat the natives as the possessors of the land, but that was the origin of all our difficulties. It was said that the colonists had always had the control of native affairs. But Governor Brown wrote that the view he had always taken of the relations which ought to exist between himself and his responsible advisers was that, as these gentlemen were responsible to the Assembly, he should be guided by their advice, even when he differed from them, in all matters under the control of that body; but on matters affecting the Queen's prerogative and Imperial interests generally he should receive their advice, but when he differed from them in opinion he should submit their views to the consideration of the Home Government, adhering to his own, until he received an answer from England; and among Imperial objects he included all dealings with the native tribes, more especially in the negotiation for, and purchase of, land. The Colonial Office acquiesced in that view. Mr. Labouchere wrote that, after the best consideration he could give, he approved the principle laid down by Governor Brown; and, in 1859, Lord Carnarvon said that circumstances did not justify the Government in abdicating the responsibility which rested upon them in dealing with the Maori race. When Sir George Grey was in New Zealand he acted well in keeping arms out of the hands of the natives. But Governor Brown relaxed that wise restriction, and allowed arms to be sold to the natives. This has been described as "a momentary infatuation which admitted of no excuse," for the Custom House Returns of 1857 and 1859 showed that there had been imported into the Northern Island, since the relaxation of the restriction, 6,000 stand of arms, and between 30,000 and 40,000 pounds of gunpowder, with shot and caps in proportion, all of which munitions of war were supposed to have found their way into the hands of the natives. Therefore, in the present disturbances, the natives were armed with weapons purchased from the British. When Governor Grey left the colony for the Cape, Colonel Wynyard was charged with the temporary Governorship of New Zealand. Just before Governor Grey left, six provincial Parliaments were established on a small scale. During his tenure of office the General Assembly was never called together at all, and these six little Parliaments did what they thought right themselves, and when Governor Brown succeeded Colonel Wynyard no concerted action could be agreed upon. Colonel Wynward allowed the idea to grow up that the Government would not interfere in the affairs of the natives. One of the chiefs sold some land to Englishmen. The Governor was informed that the chief's title would be disputed, and that the surveyors would not be allowed to mark out the ground. Colonel Wynyard said the sellers might mark it out themselves, and he would have nothing to do with the matter. The native chief sent out a party to mark the ground, and they were slain, and then the other party retaliated and made war upon the murderers. Among the Maories there were men who had acquired something like civilization, and they were desirous of living in peace with their neighbours; and as they saw that the Governors would not put the law in force in the case of tribal disputes, they determined on an assembly of natives for the purpose of appointing a King to rule over them. Such was the origin of the King movement. It was a wholesome movement, and might have been productive of much good if the Governor had turned it into the right channel, and established a native magistrate subordinate to the paramount authority of the Queen. At the same time with the King movement another movement, called the land movement, grew up. The natives were told that the land in their possession was desired by the Europeans, and they thought what was valuable for Europeans must be also valuable to themselves, and they formed a league for the purpose of preventing the sale of any more land to the Europeans. That proceeding would have been justifiable if confined to the land over which they had acquired a right by the Treaty of Waitangi; but they went beyond that, and declared not only that no man belonging to the confederacy should sell any land to the Europeans, but that no native should part with any portion of his land. These proceedings culminated in the Taranaki war of 1862. The settlers there were confined to a narrow strip of land on the sea shore. Finding the settlement too small for their energies, they wanted to purchase other land from the natives, but the sale was prohibited by the land league. Governor Brown, who kept the entire control of native affairs in his hands, went to Taranaki, and attended a meeting at which Zekera, a great chief, said he was willing to part with his land. Governor Brown said he would have the title investigated, and if it was approved of he would purchase the land. The chief then laid a map at the Governor's feet in token that he had surrendered the land; but another chief, whose English name was William King, although he admitted the title, refused to permit the sale, and left the assembly with a considerable show of discourtesy to the Governor. The Governor, having taken counsel with the Secretary for Native Affairs, came to the conclusion that the title was satisfactory, and agreed that the land should be taken possession of, and the first instalment paid down immediately. The Waitara war commenced in consequence of an attack upon a surveying party by the natives, who fell upon them and killed them. Sometimes that war languished, but it never entirely died out. Sometimes large masses of Imperial troops were dispatched against the natives, but in vain. Sometimes there was only an occasional inroad on a border settlement; but from the time when Governor Brown, in the exercise of his discretion as an Imperial officer, without consultation with his native Ministry, bought the Taranaki land, New Zealand had not been free from war, and the disastrous results of the land policy he had endeavoured to describe were felt throughout that unhappy country. On one occasion particularly, in the Wanganui district, to the south of Taranaki, the war broke out with such violence that 6,000 or 7,000 of Her Majesty's troops were despatched, under General Cameron, against the natives; £3,000,000 was raised under an Imperial guarantee; great exertions were made throughout the colony, and it was supposed there would be a dash at the rebels' stronghold, and that at last there would be peace. But then was disclosed a state of affairs truly lamentable. Governor Grey and General Cameron had got to loggerheads; every mail brought home remonstrances from the Governor against the General, and insulting despatches from the General against the Governor. Imperial interests were entirely lost sight of. The money of the colony and the blood of our soldiers were sacrificed to a miserable quarrel between the Governor and the General. General Cameron declined to attack a pah with 5,000 or 6,000 European troops, but the Governor offered to send 200 colonial troops to take the pah. Eventually he did so, and some 200 or 300 colonial soldiers, without any assistance from the Imperial troops, captured the pah after a smart fight. To use European troops to encounter the Maories was like using an hatchet to break an egg. They were not suited to that kind of warfare. Soon after it was determined by the Colonial Office to resign all control over native affairs, and give matters entirely up to the responsible advisers of the Governor of New Zealand. Mr. Weld, formerly Prime Minister in the colony, wrote a Paper describing the state of things in 1864. When the Assembly met the Ministers resigned, after an unseemly altercation with the Governor. England naturally enough was dissatisfied with the lavish expenditure of blood and money; the natives were defeated but not subdued; the colony had neither money nor credit; its debentures were unsaleable; its accounts largely overdrawn; and the Parliament was disorganized. That state of things had arisen from the mismanagement of this country. Then were sown the first seeds of that horrible fanaticism, known as the Hau-hau fanaticism, the latest development of which was to be found in the last mail. The fanatics believed that the Virgin Mary had taken them under her special protection, and made them invulnerable and immortal. They had cannibal rites of the most horrible description, and established a system of communism, in order, as their prophet said, that their descendants might number as many men as there were sands on the sea-shore. The Government had admitted that it was not the settlers or their policy, but that of the Home Government alone, which had landed the colony in such a lamentable condition; and then, when they decided to withdraw their troops—and with them, as the Maories believed, the countenance of the Queen—from the settlers, the Home Government committed a cruel injustice. They had sown the wind and had left the colonists to reap the whirlwind. The colonists lost no time in protesting against the determination of the Government to abandon all control over the affairs of the colony, and against the imputation that they did not sufficiently defend themselves; and the Legislative Council in their Address to the Governor, transmitted by him to the Home Government, represented that the whole of the ablebodied male population of the Taranaki settlement, over the age of sixteen years, had been for two years and a-half in full military service, and that the taxation amounted to £5 per head per annum on the whole European population of both islands. It was, however, decided that the troops should be withdrawn, and at this moment the last British red-coat was being withdrawn from the colony. He did not believe that the House of Commons would resist the cry of a nation in its direst peril. It was hardly necessary to remind the House of recent events. Some fierce fanatics who had been deported from the shores of New Zealand to the Chatham Islands, and who were kept in safe custody there for a considerable time, seized a vessel and made their escape to New Zealand. They landed at Poverty Bay, and committed atrocities which threw the whole island into a ferment. The Volunteers were called out, and a strong appeal was made to the Home Government to allow a single regiment to remain, not to fight, but to remove the impression among the Maories that the Queen looked with displeasure upon the colonists of the Northern Island. The rebels pointed triumphantly to the withdrawal of the troops, and urged the friendly Maories to show their loyalty to Her Majesty by assisting them to drive the settlers into the sea. That was a result which the British authorities, by their policy, had been unwittingly lending themselves to. Now that the last plea of the colonists for assistance had been rejected he feared that a general rising of the native tribes would be the result, and then, fatigued and harassed by continual war, the settlers might be unable to withstand the united rush of the natives. He knew it was difficult to reverse a policy, but he thought our colonies ought to be treated as distant parts of this country, and he deplored the spirit in which this question had been discussed in England. If, however, the hearts of the British people were aroused—if they knew what the New

Zealand colonists had done to help themselves, he did not believe that they would refuse the helping hand for which the colonists now asked. This was not a question affecting New Zealand alone, for if this country repudiated its obligations to a colony in its direst distress, the colonists would naturally look about for some other country which had sterner ideas of the duty of a parent state to a colony. New Zealand might negotiate with the Australian colonies to form a confederation for mutual protection against external and internal attack, or might claim the protection of such a nation as the United States; and, in the present state of our relations with that country, he would ask whether it would be agreeable to complicate matters by a protectorate asserted by the United States over one of our colonies. He was sure his right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies would not be unmoved by the tale which he had unfolded. We were now threatened, he believed, with war, and he felt not only for the settlers, but for the Maories, among whom there were friendly tribes who had always shown a leaning towards this country and her civilization. But if by our policy we made it clear that nothing but a war of extermination was to be hoped for, and we announced to the settlers that they must rely on their own strong arms alone, what would be the result? Why, that sympathetic aid would be called in from the neighbouring colony of Australia, whose wild spirits would seek in the confiscation of the native lands the reward of any assistance which they might render. Hitherto we had not confiscated the lands of the native tribes we had conquered. That was a great error, for it caused them to regard us with contempt, and to cease to believe in the power of our arms. As things now stood the Maories were fast dying out. They had diminished from 80,000 — which was their number in the days of Captain Cook—to something like 38,000; and if a war of annihilation were now embarked in not a single Maori would, in all probability, be left at the expiration of ten years. That would be the result of the policy which the Aborigines Protection Society had been the means of commencing. He believed, however, that many of the natives might be saved if it were only made known to them that it was the wish of our Queen that they should enter into relations of amity and friendship with the settlers. Let the friendly tribes be civilized, but if necessary, let those Hau-hau fanatics, with their weasel-like thirst for blood, be utterly stamped out, and let not all be mixed up in one indiscriminate hotch-potch. Let us adopt the maxim *Divide et impera.* He would simply, in conclusion, express a hope that aid would be given to the settlers—he could not believe that the British nation would refuse to listen to their prayer. He believed that when the heart of the British people was appealed to, there was but one response which they would give, or which they dared to give.

Mr. MAGNIAC said, every one connected with New Zealand must thank the noble Viscount for the manner in which he had pleaded for the colonists. He had also to thank the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for the Colonies for the manner in which he had attended to representations which had been made to him on behalf of the colony of New Zealand, although he had not been able to give effect to them. He (Mr. Magniac) believed the value of our trade with New Zealand and the interest which we had in the prosperity of that colony were little understood in this country. The Returns for 1867 showed that the value of the direct imports of British manufactures into it for that year was £2,750,000, while the amount of the imports from Australia was £1,500,000, the total imports into the colony for the year having been about £5,000,000. The exports, he might add, for 1868, gave a total of £4,500,000, of which £4,000,000 came direct to this country, £1,500,000 in the shape of wool, and the remainder in gold. During the last ten years the value of the British manufactures imported into the colony was no less than £17,000,000; and these facts proved, he thought, that we depended to no inconsiderable extent on our trade with it for the comfort and well-being of our manufacturing classes. The settlers whom we were asked to aid were our own blood and sinew, and he believed that the country would recognize the fact that blood was thicker than water, and would be prepared to do their duty by New Zealand, even at the expense of their pockets. Governor Bowen attached the utmost importance to the presence of European troops for their effect, not only upon the European mind, but upon the mind of the friendly natives, who had stood by us, regardless of danger to themselves and their families, and certainly deserved consideration at our hands. The effect of British troops upon them was described as something not to be believed, and he was afraid of the effect upon them when the last red-coat left New Zealand. Such a withdrawal, it was justly said, was as though it had been proposed to withdraw British troops from Scotland in 1715 and 1745, from Ireland in 1798, or from British India in 1857. It was alleged that only a certain limited number of natives were in arms against the Queen. No doubt the natives might be divided into three classes—hostile, neutral, and friendly. But the departure of the red-coats would be the signal for the neutral natives at once to throw themselves into the arms of the hostile Maories; the friendly natives would be unable to maintain their ground; and in the district of Wellington, with which he happened to be acquainted, there were already signs that natives, who had been looked upon as the most certain in their loyalty, were now wondering what they were to do. The massacres and outrages which had occurred, and the devastation of settlements, had brought the greatest distress upon many colonists, and he knew numbers of families, previously living in affluence, who were at this moment penniless. But it was said — "Why do not the colonists depend upon themselves, there being 220,000 colonists against 38,000 natives?" But the natives were concentrated in the Northern Island, while only from 70,000 to 75,000 Europeans were there, of whom from 40,000 to 50,000 were located in the principal towns. Thus between 30,000 and 40,000 Europeans — men, women, and children — were scattered about from one end of the island to the other, some very unused to arms and unfit to fight, while among the natives the women were almost as apt as the men, assisting in the pahs, loading the guns, and even firing them on occasion, and aiming very straight. Again, it had been said that the colonists ought to get somebody to fight for them. That was exactly what they had done. In the course of the last five years this colony of 220,000 had expended no less than £2,750,000 for military purposes, their annual military expenditure being at the rate of nearly £2 per head, whereas the annual military expenditure of this country only amounted to about £1 per head. In a letter which he held in his hand from an eminent member of the Legislative Assembly, it was stated that the colony was expending more blood and treasure than it could possibly afford. Upon the subject of the quality of the men raised, it was impossible that the colony could be blamed upon that ground, as it was a matter of extreme difficulty to get men at any price to imperil their lives in a country where the services of the common labourer were so valuable. The cost of the common soldier in the colony had been estimated at £150, and, consequently, the expenditure involved by keeping on foot a force of 1,500 was very considerable. The result of the present state of affairs in the colony was that settlers in all districts were leaving in large numbers, the Customs revenues were falling off, and the exports were being reduced. Under these circumstances it was impossible that the colony could support an enormous military expenditure without some extraneous help. If that help were not forthcoming the war would degenerate into an irregular war, to which numbers of wild spirits would be attracted in the hope of appropriating the lands of the natives whom they would exterminate, and the result would be a disgrace, not only to the colony, but to this country. It was impossible for this country to shake off the responsibility imposed by the treaty of Waitangi. Former Governments had not held the views now held by the Colonial Secretary. It had been suggested that the colony should employ friendly natives, under white officers, to fight for them; but the result of all attempts to employ native soldiers had been that no prisoners were taken, all who fell into the hands of the victorious party being massacred without mercy. Did the Goorkas or the Sikhs make any prisoners in their campaigns? It had been also suggested that the colonists should make peace with the natives, but that advice came ill from a Government which had at one time 16,000 soldiers in the colony. He complained bitterly of the Home Government offering for sale in the colony large quantities of surplus gunpowder, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Colonial Government, who represented the danger of its falling into the hands of the natives. The noble Viscount who had brought this question before the House had stated that the colony did not ask for men, although a very modest request had been made within the last month to the Home Government that they would permit the only regiment that was still in New Zealand to remain there until the result of the present crisis of the war was known in this country. That request had, however, not been acceded to. As the noble Viscount said, a guarantee, under perfectly unexceptionable conditions, was asked for; but that request was not acceded to. Under these circumstances gentlemen who took the deepest interest in the colony made up their minds to ask for nothing more, but to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, and ultimately of this House. He trusted, however, that means would be found to give the colony some small aid. The lives of 10,000 English men, women, and children, to say nothing of the natives, were dependent on the manner in which this question was dealt with.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that, after the eloquent speech of the noble Viscount the Member for Berwick (Viscount Bury), he would not enter at any length into the history of the evils which had brought the colony of New Zealand into its present condition, but he might say that he had received communications which corroborated every statement of the noble Viscount. During the last few years it had been the policy to leave the colony to itself, but in that time horrors had been perpetrated in New Zealand which people in this country would hardly realize. In December last a despatch from the Governor of New Zealand warned the Government against the fatal step of withdrawing the Imperial troops, stating that a number of friendly natives had waited upon him, and complained that they were being abandoned to the Queen's enemies. He feared that if Her Majesty's Government persisted in its present policy they would desert the English cause. Letters, which he had received, stated that unless some assistance were afforded to the colonists they would be unable to cope with the evils surrounding them, and it was suggested that Government aid might be given in opening up roads throughout the country for the troops. He trusted that the general appeal which had been made to the Government would induce them to do something for a colony which afforded excellent openings for emigrants from this country.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought it would be evident to anyone who knew the difficulty of guarding a large extent of coast that it must be impossible to keep gunpowder and arms out of the hands of the native population of New Zealand, especially as many of the Maories possessed ships, and performed considerable voyages. The noble Viscount (Viscount Bury) had stated that there never had been a period of positive tranquillity in the province, but when he (Sir Charles Dilke) was there, in 1866, perfect tranquillity prevailed, and the Governor made a peaceful progress through the island, and was received by the chiefs of the now hostile tribes on the east coast. Though he dissented from the conclusions to which the noble Viscount had come, he admitted that our early dealings with the Maories were not what they might have been. The despatches of Lord Carnarvon showed that the policy of the present Government was adopted at the Colonial Office a long time ago, and the Duke of Buckingham, in a despatch last year, while deploring the fresh disturbances which had arisen, stated that the Government did not feel at liberty to assume the çontrol of native affairs or undertake the duty of defending the colony from native disburbances. With regard to the proposal for leaving the 18th Regiment in New Zealand, it had been refused in the most emphatic way by the colonists themselves. The hon. Member who had just spoken said it was the policy of the Imperial Government to leave the country alone. That had, in fact, always been the policy of the colony itself, which had asserted its independence in even a defiant manner. He, like other hon. Members, had received many letters from the colony on this subject; and it was rather curious to find that, although intended to tell strongly against the Colonial Office, when closely examined they told very strongly in faxour of the Colonial Office. The Colonial Government had never observed those stipulations which the Home Government had prescribed. Whatever might be said now, it was clear that the colony had assumed an attitude of self-reliance. That had invariably been the tone of Mr. Stafford, the able Prime Minister. There had been a suggestion that the North Island of New Zealand should be abandoned; but, before such an idea was seriously entertained, it would be well to remember the present proportions of the population, as between the whites and the natives. The population of the whites had been understated that evening, while that of the hostile Maories had been overstated. According to Sir George Bowen's showing there were now in the North Island only 38,000 Maories, of whom only about 3,000 or 4,000 were absolutely hostile, and 16,000 were friendly. In 1851, there were about 58,000 whites and 56,000 Maories; but, in 1867, the number of whites was 227,000, exclusive of the diggers, who were very numerous, and he (Sir Charles Dilke) believed that, at present, the white population was not fewer than 280,000. Nothing could be more preposterous than the notion that that large body of English settlers would be willing to give up so prosperous and fertile an island to a mere handful, comparatively speaking, of hostile natives. What, then, was to be done? The colonists would not accept troops except on conditions of local control, which the Colonial Office could not possibly assent to. Purely local troops must be maintained from purely local resources. With regard to a loan, it seemed to him a very lame conclusion of all that had been said on this subject that they should be asked to guarantee a loan of £1,500,000. The credit of New Zealand had greatly improved of late years, and the colonists need not look to the mother country for financial assistance. He had been informed that in 1863 the colony issued a 6 per cent at 83, and it fell to 60, but that now she could issue one at a price between 90 and 100. This surely was not the time when England should resume the oft-condemned policy of guarantees. As respected the future he would suggest that the prohibition of settlement in disturbed districts should be strictly enforced; that honours should be conferred on leading friendly natives as a means of securing their attachment, and welding them into a homogeneous force—the practice of sending swords and badges should be continued and extended—and that the Imperial Government should give encouragement to the native-King movement. Thousands of natives, extremely friendly to the British Government, were also passionately attached to that movement. At this moment there was no sign that the native-King flag was likely to be raised against this country, and he saw no reason why it should not be recognized, to the extent of reserving a certain portion of the North Island for the natives, in which the writs of the Colonial Government should not be allowed to run, but reserving the suzerainty of the Home Government.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, however much hon. Members who had listened to the debate might differ on other points, there was one point on which there could be no difference of opinion, and that was that the House was greatly indebted to the noble Viscount for the exhaustive and eloquent speech in which he had brought the question forward. The noble Viscount (Viscount Bury) had attributed the present troubles of New Zealand in a great measure to the Aborigines Protection Society. Now he (Mr. Fowler) had been a member of that society for nineteen years, and he denied that the society had any such power for good or for evil as that attributed to it. To hear some people talk one would think it a powerful organization like the Anti-Corn Law League of former days. But what was it? It consisted of a number of gentlemen who took an interest in colonial questions, and who made it their business to seek the redress of the grievances of the natives when grievances were proved to exist. Their proceedings consisted, in a great measure, of representations addressed to the Secretary of State, and to the authorities in the colonies, and their object was to do as as much good as possible to the natives. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who had long filled the Office of Colonial Secretary with advantage to the country and with honour to himself, as to whether they had ever encouraged them to any course of factious oppposition to the Government? The Maories were not the despicable race that the noble Viscount appeared to believe. The conduct of the Hau-haus had been such as must be reprobated in the strongest terms, but this must be put down to the successive wars and difficulties of New Zealand during twenty years. The progress made by the Maories in social elevation had been described in encouraging terms by Sir George Grey, Sir William Martin, and other authorities; and for this we were very much indebted to the labours of those devoted men who went forth among them as missionaries. Ten years ago Sir William Martin, Chief Justice of New Zealand, drew a picture of the natives of that colony which did honour to their race. He said they were an industrious and intelligent race, that they grew a large portion of the corn produced in the colony, bought mills and vessels, accumulated considerable sums of money by a system of co-operative labour, readily gave land for schools, and took steps of their own accord to repress drunkenness and immorality. That was their state ten years ago; but unhappy contests with regard to the land afterwards sprang up, and led the Maories into the commission of acts which could not be defended. They were, however, the original possessors of the soil; they had seen it taken away from them, and their feelings might be supposed to be those of the Gaels, as described by Sir Walter Scott—

> "The stranger came with iron hand,
> And from our fathers reft the land."

The description which Sir George Bowen gave of his tour throughout the Northern Island was very favourable to the natives; he compared the present state of the Northern Island to that of the Highlands of Scotland 130 years ago. The same progress might be expected, and he trusted that the native race of New Zealand would one day take their place among the foremost races of the world. The affair of Taranaki, of which the noble Viscount had given an account, was very differently represented by Archdeacon Hadfield, in the pamphlet published by him. He distinctly stated that the war had nothing to do with the land league; that the natives did not kill the surveying party, but merely drove them away. In further contradiction of the noble Viscount (Viscount Bury), he declared that in the war in Taranaki the land had been bought with the sanction of the Colonial Ministry, and that Sir George Grey, on his appointment, had ordered an inquiry which resulted in the restoration of the land to William King, the chief with whom we had gone to war. With respect to Te Kooti, the present chief of the rebel Maories, it must be admitted that his conduct was utterly indefensible, and that, in fact, he was now a miscreant; but it must not be forgotten that formerly he was a loyal subject of the Queen, and that he was unjustly arrested and sent to imprisonment. It appeared that when he was serving under the British Government he went into the rebel camp for the purpose of persuading his brother, who was fighting against the British army, to come over to the loyal party. This circumstance coming to the knowledge of the authorities, he was placed under arrest, and sent to Chatham Island, from which place he subsequently made his escape. This unjust treatment was the primary cause of Te Kooti's rebellious conduct. Allusion had been made to the services of Sir George Grey. All must respect the character of that distinguished man. The services which had been rendered by Sir George Grey, when Governor of the colony, entitled him to the best thanks of this country, and he only regretted that any differences should have arisen between him and the Government of this country to prevent his continuing to hold that office. The noble Earl the present Secretary for the Colonies also deserved the approval of the public for the despatch in which he reprobated the offer of prize money for the heads of rebels taken in war. Had the debate not already occupied considerable time he should have called the attention of the Government at length to a Paper by Mr. Manning, which had been presented to the House, in which, at page 61, he laid down the importance of the action of the native land courts in promoting the civilization of New Zealand; but he should now content himself with expressing a hope that the recommendations contained in that Paper would receive due attention at the hands of the Government and of the authorities in New Zealand. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) had referred to the native-King movement, and he agreed with all the remarks that had fallen from the hon. Baronet on that point. Had that movement been met by the British Government in a friendly instead of a hostile spirit, the colony might have been preserved from many of the evils which had now to be deplored. He was glad to observe that Sir George Bowen gave a somewhat qualified approval to the movement, and believed that it might be made compatible with the sovereignty of the Queen. The noble Viscount had wound up his speech by advocating what might almost be described as a policy of extermination. If such a policy were to be adopted, it would be a disgrace to our civilization and to Christianity. He rejoiced to believe that it received no support from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and that, instead of attempting to exterminate the natives, he was anxious to bring them within the pale of civilization. Whatever might be said of other races in our colonies, he thought it must be admitted that the Maories were a race of people capable of civilization, and it would be a disgrace to this country if they were not civilized, as such a result would be entirely owing to our own mismanagement. The policy of Sir George Bowen was exactly contrary to that of the noble Viscount, being founded on the belief that the Maories could be governed upon the same principles as the natives of India were. In conclusion, he trusted that this country would always pursue a firm and reasonable, instead of an exterminating, policy towards the noble and manly race with whom the colonists in New Zealand were now at war.

MR. MONSELL said, he felt bound, at the outset of the observations which he was about to make, to express his gratitude to his noble Friend who had introduced the subject under discussion to the notice of the House, as well as to his hon. Friend the Member for St. Ives (Mr. Magniac) for the manner in which they had spoken of him personally. He could assure them, speaking on behalf of the Government, that he approached that subject with the deepest pain, and that he sympathized no less than his noble Friend in the sufferings of the colonists which he had so eloquently described, while he had no less anxiety to do everything to redress those sufferings which justice and policy would allow. On the other hand he was satisfied his noble Friend would admit that it would not be right in such a matter as that with which the House was dealing, to act on the impulse of feeling or under the influence which might be produced by mere panic. It was the duty of the Government fairly and fully to consider what the relations of this country were to the colonists, as well as those of both to the Maories, and decide the question accordingly. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) had referred to the present condition of New Zealand, and there could be no doubt that the statements which he had made were perfectly accurate. The number of Maories now in the North Island was certainly not more than 35,000 or 36,000; and of those 10,000 were cut off from the rest by the isthmus on which Auckland stood, and they were, and had for many years been, friendly to this country. Of the remainder, a very large proportion were friendly also, while those who were neutral were powerful and numerous. He was sure the House would listen with interest to the statements in a letter referring to the subject, which had been received by his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General, within the last few days, from a connection of his in New Zealand. The letter was not written for the purpose of publication, nor was it dressed up in order to advocate any particular view. It was written by a man of considerable eminence, Mr. Seymour, who was for some time Superintendent of Marlborough, and who it was also right to state, possessed property to a considerable extent in New Zealand, not only in the Southern but also in the Northern Island. Now, the statement of that gentleman, who, there could be no doubt, was a competent authority on the subject on which he wrote, would, he thought, give some relief to the mind of his noble Friend. Mr. Seymour said—

> "There is no war of races, and I do not think it will ever turn to one. For the natives may be divided into three bodies—friendly, neutral, and hostile. I think the friendly are the most numerous, and they have been giving us great help, and, what is more, have been suffering with us too. The neutrals are also a large body, who some years back under their king retired into a comparatively small district lying on the west coast round about Kawhia harbour. These then surrounded themselves with imaginary lines termed 'Aukati,' past which no European was to come; if any ventured, they were warned back; if they persisted, their foolhardiness generally resulted in the loss of their clothes, &c.; but in no case was personal violence offered that I ever heard of, or their lives placed in danger. These Kingites, then, still maintain this attitude of strict neutrality. These two classes embrace most of the native population; the hostile are few in num-

ber, but from the cause above are capable of doing vast mischief. I do not think masses of British troops would be of ány service to us. The British soldier cannot, or rather, is not allowed to fight or even to be trained to that mode of fighting which only can be useful here. Our self-reliant policy was and is still best, and undoubtedly most likely to succeed. Our fault was the common fault of the British—that of being unprepared."

Now, that was a letter which, in his opinion, was very much calculated to alter the judgment of those who took such a gloomy view of the state of affairs in New Zealand as he had heard expressed by some hon. Gentlemen that evening. The noble Lord (Viscount Bury) said that the evils existing in New Zealand had been caused by the Home Government. Now, they had been reminded in the course of the debate that successive Governments had deliberately adopted and carried out that very policy towards New Zealand which the noble Lord now condemned, and they had likewise been reminded, with great truth, of the great importance of that colony to England. There was hardly a Gentleman in that House who had not a friend or a relative in New Zealand, and it represented the different classes of which English society was composed probably more completely than any other colony. It seemed to him therefore absurd to suppose that successive Governments should have deliberately adopted a policy hostile to the best interests of such a colony. After all, every suggestion that was made, whether for troops or for guarantees, amounted in some way or other to this—that the tax-payers of this country ought to be called on to contribute towards the internal affairs of New Zealand; but he maintained that the tax-payers of England had no more to say to the internal affairs of New Zealand than the tax-payers of New Zealand had to say to the internal affairs of England. The noble Viscount had spoken of the way in which they had governed New Zealand; but if a Government conscientiously did its best in regard to a colony, it was idle to contend that on account of possible mistakes which it might have made—for no Government was infallible—it was to be called on to pay some contribution or to acknowledge that it had contracted some debt towards the colony. In 1854, when responsible government was adopted in New Zealand, the Legislative Assembly addressed the Governor, congratulating him on the progress of the colony and on the good relations which existed between the two races inhabiting it. Native affairs had up to that time been carefully excluded from the control of the colonists; but the colonists afterwards began to seek some control over those affairs. In 1858 or 1859 a demand was made that the Native Minister should be responsible to the Governor in Council—that was to say, to the Government which had the confidence of the colony. When that demand was sent home by Governor Gore Brown, it was objected to by Lord Carnarvon, who felt that there were certain obligations on our part towards the natives which he could not be sure would be properly discharged if that concession were made to the colony. A remarkable correspondence passed between Sir George Lewis—who acted as Secretary of State for the Colonies during the Duke of Newcastle's absence in Canada — and Mr. Richmond, a distinguished colonist of New Zealand. Mr. Richmond made the demand on the Imperial Government that 5,000 troops, involving an expense of about £150,000 a year, should be maintained for the defence of the outlying settlements. Sir George Lewis replied that wise government and prudent conduct on the part of the settlers would, in his opinion, do far more than an increased military force to maintain on a satisfactory footing the relations between the Europeans and the natives; and he pointed out that the outlying settlements were in a position in which it would be utterly impossible for this country to protect them. Such were the views of the Home Government on that subject; and therefore those who went to those outlying settlements were given to understand that they went on their own responsibility; they knew the dangers to which they would be exposed, and that it was utterly impossible for any Government to shield them from such risks. Mr. Weld himself had recognized that no amount of British troops could possibly protect the settlers in those districts. Therefore the settlers were fairly warned from the very first by the Government of this country. In 1861, when Sir George Grey returned to New Zealand, he found the colonists possessed with the idea that it was absolutely essential they should have the control over native affairs in the same way as they had over their own. Sir George Grey, indeed, found this feeling to be so strong that he took on himself the responsibility of giving effect to it without waiting for the decision of the Secretary of State, and he wrote a despatch home explaining his conduct. To that despatch the Duke of Newcastle, on May 26, 1862, replied, sanctioning the placing of the natives under the control of the Assembly, stating that he could not disguise from himself that the endeavour to keep the management of the natives under the control of the Home Government had failed, and that it could only be mischievous to retain a shadow of responsibility when the beneficial exercise of power had become impossible. He therefore acceded to the demand of the colonists. It was true that when his despatch reached New Zealand the Colonial Government declined to accept the boon they had sought, for the simple reason that they wanted to have the power, but did not desire to pay the expenses to which it would render them liable. But in a subsequent despatch of great ability, dated February 24, 1863, the Duke of Newcastle explained his view of the whole of the transactions which had occurred, and refused to withdraw the gift he had made to the colonists, telling them distinctly that what they had asked for and obtained they must keep, and that with it they must bear a considerable portion, at all events, of the expenditure for their own defence, and the Legislature of New Zealand, relying upon the cordial co-operation of the Imperial Government for the future, cheerfully, by a unanimous vote, accepted the responsibility thus placed on the colonists. The Imperial Government gave its assistance with no niggardly hand; 10,000 Imperial troops with 6,000 colonial troops, took the field, aided by a fleet of steamers and gunboats, but these great forces were paralyzed by the system of double government, which, to quote Mr. Weld's words, was "the root of half the misfortunes that occurred;" and, in November, 1864, the colony was nearly prostrate. The natives, as my noble Friend has said, quoting Mr. Weld's words, "were defeated but not subdued." Taranaki had not been reconquered; escaped prisoners occupied a fortified position within sight of Auckland; the colony had neither money nor credit. Then it was that the Government of Mr. Weld was formed. The system of double government had broken down—Mr. Weld refused to take Office unless it were abandoned. The principles upon which his Government was formed are clearly laid down in a Memorandum he submitted to the Governor in November, 1864. After expressing his opinion that double government had resulted in evil to both races of Her Majesty's subjects in New Zealand, he recognized the right of the Home Government to interfere as long as the colony received the aid of British troops, but said he was prepared to accept the alternative, and would recommend the Assembly to ask for the entire withdrawal of British troops, and also to ask the Home Government to issue such instructions as would enable the Governor to be guided by the recommendations of his constitutional advisers, except only upon such matters as concerned the Imperial interests and the Prerogative of the Crown. That reservation would have been sufficient to prevent a war of extermination between the two races, because Her Majesty's Government could not be absolved from the obligations of the treaty of Waitangi, and the rights of the natives were secured under that treaty. With that limitation, however, a demand was made by Mr. Weld for absolute and entire self-government. He required that the whole of the land forces should be withdrawn from New Zealand with the least possible delay, and had since stated distinctly, having before his eyes the present lamentable state of things, that in his opinion it was due, in part at all events, to the fact that his demand had not been entirely acceded to at once—was due, therefore, not to the removal of the troops, but to the delay in their removal. Mr. Weld insisted not only upon getting rid of the Imperial troops, but upon keeping up a sufficient colonial force, and, with the assistance of Major Atkinson, succeeded to a great extent in effecting this object; but he was turned out of Office. Mr. Stafford became Prime Minister, and, unfortunately, the colony was left without sufficient defence against the inevitable results of the system of confiscation that was carried on. Mr. Weld had recommended that 1,500 colonial troops should be kept on foot, armed and trained with special reference to the nature of the services required. This policy was not adhered to by his successor, and there were nothing but raw and undisciplined recruits to suppress the recent rising, notwithstanding the repeated and energetic warnings against confiscation by his right hon. Friend the present Secretary for War. Confiscation was carried on, and, at the same time, the colonial military force was not kept up. Allusion had been made to the natives who escaped from the Chatham Islands. Now he believed—though his information was not official—that these prisoners were sent to the Chatham Islands for two years. They behaved well while there, but finding they were not released when the time expired they made their escape, and it must always be remembered that, with the exception of one person who lost his life in the scuffle, they inflicted no injury upon anybody. When they landed, however, it was attempted to re-capture them, and, as the House knew, the result of that attempt was lamentable. At the other side of the island—of this, again, there is no official information—in the course of the campaign under General Chute, some horses had been taken away from the Maories. They were re-taken by the natives, two of whom were seized as hostages for their return. The result was an encounter in which two or three people lost their lives, and he believed that the rising upon the east coast was precipitated by this circumstance. He thought he had clearly shown that the demand for the removal of the troops was made by the colonists themselves; that it was insisted upon by them in the strongest manner; that after Mr. Weld went out of Office they omitted to take the precautions which common sense suggested for their own protection; and that it was on account of the absence of precautions that these lamentable events had occurred. Under these circumstances was it quite reasonable that the colonists should come to this country and ask us to assist them? It was obvious that the reason why the colonists had not hitherto provided for their own defence was that, as long as British troops remained in the island, they looked to them for protection, and imagined that they would be extricated from any difficulty by the assistance of the mother country. That was the opinion of Mr. Weld, who had re-stated it in an able pamphlet which he had written within the last few months. He therefore said deliberately that in his opinion it would be a cruel gift to the colonists to thrust them back upon the old system, which entirely broke down under their hands—and to lead them to depend upon the mother country instead of upon themselves. He hoped therefore that the House would approve of the conduct of the Government in refusing to leave the British troops in New Zealand. Then came the question raised by his noble Friend with regard to the guarantee. His noble Friend spoke of the heavy taxation which pressed upon New Zealand, but he had not taken into account the difference in the incidence of taxation in this country and in New Zealand. In his financial statement made in September, 1865, the Colonial Treasurer said—

> "I must be allowed, while admitting the weight of the burdens laid upon the shoulders of the people of this colony, to deprecate the exaggeration with which this subject has been treated in many quarters, and which appears to me calculated to excite unnecessary discontent within the colony, as well as seriously to injure its position in the estimation of persons at a distance. The positive as well as the comparative weight of the taxation of New Zealand has been frequently over-stated. The sum per head paid for duties of Customs, which constitutes four-fifths of the public revenue, amounts, it is true, to £3 11*s.*; but of this sum no less than £2 1*s.* 8*d.* is paid on spirits, wine, beer, and tobacco, which are generally considered fair subjects for the operations of the tax-gatherer. . . . . Again, although the amount of taxes paid by each individual in New Zealand is considerably higher than in Great Britain, being £4 10*s.* (including provision for many local services) in the former, as compared to £3 0*s.* 7*d.* (including local taxation) in the latter; yet, when it is considered that the average earnings of the labouring classes in the colony are, as a rule, more than twice as large as in the mother country, it will be found that, testing the weight of taxation by the proportion which that taxation consumes of the earnings of each adult, the position of the colonist will compare favourably with that of the tax-payer in the United Kingdom. With regard to this question of taxation generally, it has, in many of the discussions on this subject which have taken place throughout the colony, been somewhat hastily assumed that heavy taxation, if not incompatible with, is at least rarely coincident with national prosperity. I think this is a very false and mischievous impression. A reference to the statistics of the principal countries of Europe will show that, so far from this opinion being true, countries like Turkey and Russia, where the taxation is 8*s.* 4*d.* and 16*s.* 1*d.* per head respectively, are those which are far from being the most prosperous or wealthy; while the State in which—with the well-known exception of the United States—taxation is the highest—namely, the kingdom of Holland,

where the general taxation is £2 11*s.* 3*d.* per head, is admittedly one of the most flourishing."

This showed that statements which had been made with regard to the comparative taxation of the inhabitants of the colony and the people of this country were founded in error. He would not, however, rest his objection to the claim which had been put forward solely upon that consideration. It appeared to him that the worst of all governments was that of one race over another when the dominant race was supported and assisted by a superior power behind it, because such a government led to abuse and to the undue exercise of power. Upon that ground alone it appeared to him that the Government would be consulting far more the interests of both the colonists and the natives of New Zealand by leaving the Colonial Government to exercise the power they already possessed without any assistance from this country. The noble Lord had stated that this country had made a rush to take possession of the colony before France could take possession of it; but if the noble Lord would refer to Lord Normanby's letter to Captain Hobson he would find that the then Government of this country, much against their inclination, were compelled to take possession of the island in consequence of the course adopted by the New Zealand Company. He fully admitted the value of many of the suggestions that had been made in the course of the debate, and he would take care that they should be laid before the Colonial Government for their consideration. One suggestion had been made over and over again to the Colonial Government by the noble Earl at the head of the Colonial Office, and that was that steps should be taken to prevent settling upon the outlying districts where no protection whatever could be extended to the colonists. Warning after warning had been given on this subject by successive Secretaries of State. He was satisfied that so long as such settlements were dotted along the coast, they would be liable to such attacks as those which had occurred. In conclusion, he must express his deliberate opinion that the worst boon that this country could grant to the colony would be the assistance that was now asked for on its behalf. If the Government were to yield to this application, the same vicious circle would be entered upon that led to the state of affairs that existed in 1864, when the condition of the colony was far more desperate than it was at present, and the colonists would be deprived of that spirit of self-reliance which he was happy to see animated them now. Her Majesty's Government were ready and anxious to give the colony any assistance in their power. They had instructed the commanders of Her Majesty's ships in that quarter of the globe to protect the colonists in the event of any sudden disasters occurring. They were ready to aid them to procure officers, non-commissioned officers, and trained policemen; but, on the other hand, he must state most distinctly that all such assistance must be limited by the principles which he had endeavoured to lay down in the remarks he had just addressed to the House. Her Majesty's Government fully appreciated the importance of the colony and the position it was likely to occupy in the future history of the world; and, while willing to aid it within the rules he had laid down, they must decline to give them that which would prove, in their opinion, a fatal gift—stifling their energy and bringing back the lamentable state of things from which they had only just escaped.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, he wished to call attention to the extraordinary nature of the blue book upon this subject, part of which was merely a record of quarrels between the last Governor of New Zealand and the Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's forces in the colony. A more amusing part contained a number of despatches from the present Governor of the colony, who, with many poems and quotations from Sir Walter Scott's novels, endeavoured to establish a parallel between the wars of the Maories and those of the Highlanders. For his part, he should rather compare the Maories with the Fenians in Ireland, because their cry was—"New Zealand for the New Zealanders." The whole of the documents contained in the blue book were a record of the vicious result of colonial affairs being undertaken by the Home Government, and he trusted that no steps would be taken calculated to restore a policy so pregnant with disaster. The noble Viscount (Viscount Bury) had drawn a fearful picture, but he had offered no remedy, nor had he heard any valid one suggested in the course of the debate. The stories of the horrible massacres which had occurred in New Zealand were certainly harrowing, but still they ought calmly to consider what was the proper remedy for the existing state of things and not follow the first impulse of sympathy to do what must increase the evil. The noble Viscount seemed to imply that there had been a wretched feeling of parsimony on the part of the people of this country, which had deterred them from assisting their fellow-countrymen in New Zealand; but the truth was, that this country had, on the contrary, by its desire to act on the highest principles of humanity towards the natives, and to discharge its duty towards the colonists, been too long led into profuse and mischievous expenditure both of blood and money. It had also been implied that the course of abstinence and caution recently taken indicated a readiness to abandon New Zealand. To his mind it appeared to show a precisely opposite inclination. Within the last few months a line of policy had been for the first time fully pursued which would cement the only possible lasting relations between the colony and this country, The noble Viscount said that as the Imperial policy had been to blame in producing the wars, it was the duty of the country to undertake to settle them; but upon that point he took issue with the noble Viscount. The way in which the affairs of New Zealand and the land and the native questions had become complicated was by the mistakes of Crown policy; but that circumstance gave the inhabitants of New Zealand no claim upon the British tax-payers, for the Government of New Zealand was their Government; and, bad as it was, it was honestly conducted in the best supposed principles of the day in their interest, and not in ours. He rejoiced with the noble Viscount that the old system of government was gone. That double government, one half administered by the colonists, and the other half by the Crown for the native races was sure to be full of mischief, and early in 1861 the Duke of Newcastle found that it was impossible to go on with it. The old Downing Street government was bad enough, and when that was exploded the attempt still to reserve the native half of local government was worse. That being the case it was absolutely necessary to make all things square with a better state of things. The transition must be painful but the result would be beneficial, and to return to the old state of things, which bred the mischief, would be insane. First of all, it had been necessary to settle accounts with the old system; and the part taken by this country in wiping off old scores was most liberal and generous, though it was, unfortunately, not so taken by the colonists. The English Government were willing to forego all claims, and to let bygones be bygones, but the colonists carped at every item, set up counter-claims, and considered that all the expenses incurred for the Imperial troops sent out to fight their own battles, even to the horses and baggage lost in the service, ought to be charged to the mother country. When the new system of the policy and means of conducting it being left to the colonists was inaugurated, the colonists were told that they might retain the 18th Regiment, if they were willing to pay for it at the Australian rate of pay. Soldiers cost this country £100 a man, and they were offered at £40 a man, but the colonists would not accept them anyhow, except on the indefensible terms that the regiment was to fight for them gratuitously, and was also to be under their entire control. The Imperial troops were consequently withdrawn, as it was impossible to keep them in New Zealand serving colonial policy, and so that the Crown would have no control over them, but only have to call on our English subjects to pay for them whatever they might do. The war was renewed and it was quite clear that the colonists had not had time, or had not used it, to perfect a system of self-defence. The fact was, there were in that country, as in this, two parties in the Parliament — they were the self-relying party and the party who wished to go back to the old system. The self-relying party were strong enough to get the principle of self-defence carried by resolution, but were not able to obtain the means of carrying out the principle by the necessary measures of defence. The resolution to discard the English troops together with the absence of any substituted force was the cause of the horrible massacres which had occurred. He thought the speech of the noble Viscount rather contradictory in some parts, especially where, after arguing on the ground of colonial helplessness, he described the taking by a few colonial troops of the pah at Taranaki which General Cameron, at the head of the English forces, had refused to attack. That alone showed what the whole colony might do if they were left to control their own policy and meet it themselves. He fully admitted, with the noble Viscount, that the principle upon which our dealings with New Zealand was to be regulated ought to be closely watched, because we must apply the same rule to our dealings with all our other colonies. It, therefore, ought to be made clear that we had no intention of taking a retrogressive step. It was an entire mistake to suppose, as had been suggested, that the colonists would be willing to look out for another country to which to attach themselves, if they were not undertaken for by their English fellow-subjects. They would find no other country so foolish to take them on such terms; but they did not wish it. They were as much bound to the mother country as the mother country was to them—an attachment founded upon affection and strengthened by commercial considerations. But they must be content to live like Englishmen if they wished to be identified with them. They must find their own means of defence. If they had no men to spare for fighting, they must hire men, they must, as had been said, look to Australia for troops; and he did not know that they could do anything better. He would only, in conclusion, express his hope that the Government would give its hearty support to the self-reliant party in the colony, for the principles that guided that party were those that it would be for the best interest of the colony and of the Empire to uphold.

MR. R. TORRENS said, he attributed the origin of the wars in New Zealand not to the colonists grasping at the lands of the natives, but to the readiness with which land purchased from the natives had been surrendered whenever the slightest colourable pretence of a defect in title had been shown. Cases had come within his own knowledge in which land had been paid for twice or three times, because some chief had trumped up some absurd claim to it, and the result was that when these preposterous attempts were resisted the colonists were attacked, their cattle stolen, and their wives and children murdered. So far as the land question was connected at all with the recent disturbances it was connected with them in that manner. He contended that the attempt to re-take the Chatham Island prisoners was perfectly justifiable on the part of the colonists, but that alone was not the cause of the Hau-hau rebellion, and of the subsequent atrocities. There was no doubt such atrocities would give rise to desire to exterminate the Maories, but that feeling had been repressed in the colony. He quite concurred with the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Adderley) in thinking that a self-reliant policy ought to be encouraged by us. It was wholly indefensible that the tax-payers of Great Britain should be called upon to contribute 1*s*. towards the expenses of our colonial governments. He agreed that the pampering policy which had been acted upon with regard to the colony was unwise; but was it judicious to inaugurate a new policy at a juncture when the colony was suffering under such deep depression? In the Northern Island production was altogether stopped, and they were overburdened with taxation. The colonists however, did not ask for either money or soldiers, but only that the credit of this country should be pledged on their behalf to the extent of £1,500,000. He regretted that the Government were indisposed to grant this. He thought there was a great inconsistency in the couduct of the Government with respect to this matter. They refused the guarantee of the country to loans for such colonies as New Zealand, yet they had no hesitation in giving guarantees to any amount of loans for Canada. He admitted the importance of the Canadas, but it was surely of equal importance that New Zealand should be protected, where the settlers were struggling for their lives. With regard to the King movement, nothing could be more unwise than to encourage it. The system of native kingship arose in this way—When the British Government took possession of the island they abrogated the Maori laws, and established the British law. But with the law they established no means to enforce it; there were neither courts of law nor police magistrates, so that the natives were compelled to elect a king of their own. But if the Maori King were recognized and an *imperium in imperio* established, it would lead to a conflict of races of which no man could see the end. Everything should be done to induce the two races to amalgamate, and the Maories should be encouraged to take part in the government of the country, and should be treated as the settlers. He thought the Imperial Government had not gone far enough in giving independence to the colonies. The colonies had independent Legislatures for managing their own affairs, but no representative Congress like that of the States of America to which they could send their representatives, and at which they could discuss colonial subjects. The colonies had no representatives in that House, nor could they send diplomatic representatives to this country. If the colonies had the privilege of sending to this country persons as ambassadors or *chargés d'affaires* to represent their views to the Government of this country, that single concession would do much to bring about a better state of things.

Mr. DIGBY said, he wished to offer a few remarks on this question. He was aware that he spoke in the presence of several colonists, but he did not yield to any of them in the interest he took in the colony. When this country undertook to wield Imperial power over New Zealand the people were placed under Imperial protection. That was the rule in all colonizing countries. Greece and Rome always undertook the duty of protecting the people over whom their power was stretched. When New Zealand was established as a British colony in 1840, it was as much for the protection of the native interests as for those of the colonists. But the policy that had been pursued was not always wise; he believed the Land Act, which was passed early in the settlement, was the cause of all their present troubles. Under that Act the Government purchased land at a small cost and retailed it again at a large profit. The natives soon found that their interests suffered by that arrangement, and they asked to have ground-titles to their land. But our Government refused to treat with them except as to their tribal interest, and that was the great cause of the present disturbances. The noble Viscount who moved this Motion had stated that it was impossible the Maori race could survive, and that they were not amenable to civilization. In opposition to that he would quote the authority of Mr. Swainson, the late Attorney General of New Zealand, who declared, that they were a brave and warlike race, and in every way amenable to civilization. The proof of this was to be found in the fact that there was, at the present moment, a large native population who were devoted to Imperial interests and obedient to the law. The political condition of the native race was greatly attributable to our own neglect. For five years native feuds prevailed, and our rule existed only in name. It was only at the end of that time that they proceeded to elect a King in order to give them laws that they could obey; but it was impossible that this country could allow this dual government to go on. He hoped the House would excuse him for making these few remarks on a subject in which he took so deep an interest.

Mr. WHALLEY said, no one had offered any satisfactory explanation as to the cause of these chronic wars in New Zealand. He thought the Government ought to promise that there should be early next Session a full inquiry into the condition and circumstances of the settlements. The particular cause of the rebellion was not hard to discover. It was to be found in the Virgin Mary of the Hau-haus. The Hau-hau movement was, beyond doubt, inaugurated by the Jesuits, and the same cause had led to a great development of Fenianism, which he believed to be strong in New Zealand. That admitted, it would explain everything. Where Jesuit action was at work, it was only years after the disaster was accomplished that the whole conspiracy was laid bare, and sometimes it was not fully unfolded for centuries afterwards. For these reasons he hoped the House would consent to the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the origin and causes of the movement. He had had a conversation with two gentlemen who had recently returned from New Zealand, one of whom had resided there for ten years. Within the last two years a Roman Catholic chapel had been established near his residence, and ever since that time nothing but dissension and difficulty had existed. He believed that five Roman Catholic priests had been detected in communication with the rebels. In a dispatch of Sir George Grey, dated July 1846, addressed to Lord Stanley, he spoke of the proceedings of Dr. Pompalier and the Roman Catholic missionaries at the

Bay of Islands but exonerated him from all blame. This very Dr. Pompalier took over thirty Jesuit priests in 1862, who were in direct communication with the rebels. He wished to point out that this French Roman Catholic Bishop had thought himself entitled to assume a position of neutrality in the rebellions of the natives; and he would ask whether there was not fair ground for inquiry as to whether that neutrality had not degenerated into secret complicity with the rebels?

ARMY—COMMITTEES ON NEW ARMS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, it would be admitted that, looking to our colonies abroad, it was absolutely necessary not only that our small Army should be furnished with the best weapon we could place in their hands, but also that their ammunition should be the best this country could manufacture. He wished to direct attention to the two points comprised in the Question he had put on the Paper; and first, with regard to the Committee which might or might not at present be sitting at the War Office. He understood from his right hon. Friend (the Secretary of State for War) the other night, that the Committee to which he alluded had been broken up, and was no longer to exist. That Committee had been composed of most distinguished men—Lord Spencer, Colonel Fletcher, and other gentlemen of equal ability and uprightness. He did not cast any blame upon that Committee, but he did upon the orders which had latterly been given to them. A Committee to inquire into the arms of this country ought to be perfectly free and unfettered, and it ought to be a judicial and in no way a constructive Committee. Now the Committee to which he had just referred was, he believed, as free as most Committees of that kind could possibly be, and he certainly had no fault whatever to find with it. But, in future, we ought to have a Committee on which we could thoroughly rely, composed of scientific persons totally unconnected with the trade, including one or two scientific Members of Parliament. He had brought this question forward, because at the recent meeting at Wimbledon there had been in competition with the Henry-Martini rifle one or two other weapons, which had been proved to be nearly, if not quite, as good. The Duke of Cambridge's prize was not won with that rifle. He trusted therefore that his right hon. Friend would consent to the appointment of a Committee to decide what arm was the best for the service—giving all arms that might be brought forward a fair and impartial trial. An arm for our service ought to be tried not only in this country, but in India, in Canada, and on board ship; and he might here mention that a manufacturer had authorized him to state that he was perfectly prepared to send at his own cost to India, or any other country which the right hon. Gentleman might name, 200 stand of arms and 200 or more rounds of ammunition for each arm, in order that the weapon might have a fair trial. Mr. Westley Richards' gun, he might remark, was nearly a pound lighter than the Henry-Martini. As to ammunition, he had heard that the old Boxer ammunition was used, and certainly the country had amply paid for it, because the gallant gentleman having been allowed to patent that ammunition, received from the country a very large reward for it, besides obtaining a royalty on it from the trade. He had been informed, however, that that ammunition had signally failed in the East Indies, in consequence of galvanic action having taken place between the metals used. Surely, in the general interests of the service and of the general public, the matter ought to be thrown open to the trade; and, in order that this might be done, it was necessary to appoint a tribunal in which implicit trust could be placed. If such a system as he now suggested had been adopted throughout, we should not have spent so enormous a sum of money without arriving at any satisfactory result. In the event of the Government coming boldly forward when they wanted a new arm, and offering even £30,000 for it, he believed that manufacturers would readily come before a proper tribunal, and that the result would be most satisfactory. In conclusion, he asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is the intention of the Government to make any and what alteration in the system hitherto adopted of appointing permanent or special Committees to choose new Arms for the Service, when modern requirements render it necessary to adopt Arms of new pattern or improved principle of construction; and, if it is the intention of the Government to sanction the expenditure of Public Money by Officers at the head of Government Manufacturing Departments in trying experiments, for which, if successful, they are permitted to take out Patents, thereby levying a Tax upon the trade created by the article being adopted by the Government, the Public Purse being saddled with the expenditure if the experiment be unsuccessful?

Mr. MACFIE was of opinion that the Patent Laws ought to be abolished, if this country were to compete on equal terms with the continental nations.

Mr. CARDWELL said, he entirely agreed with the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the only object the War Office should have was to get the best weapon and ammunition at a moderate price for the public service. About ten years ago the heads of the establishments at Woolwich were members of the Ordnance Select Committee, but at that time the Committee was re-constituted, and those gentlemen ceased to be members of it. His right hon. Friend who preceded him in the War Office (Sir John Pakington) dissolved the old Ordnance Select Committee, and it was the intention of the right hon. Baronet to substitute for it a small Committee which should sit at Woolwich. It appeared to him (Mr. Cardwell), however, that a Committee sitting at Woolwich was not what we wanted. He thought there ought to be a closer connection with the War Office and with Parliament in the Committee that should advise him; consequently, he constituted a Committee to sit, not at Woolwich, but in Pall Mall. Of that Committee his noble Friend the Under Secretary for War was president, and his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) was a member of it, as was also the Director General of Ordnance, the Controller-in-Chief, the Inspector General of Artillery, the Inspector General of Engineers, the Inspector General of Naval Ordnance, and other persons who were above the suspicion of being actuated by any desire but that of promoting the interests of the public service. When a special Committee was required to examine any particular article they appointed such a Committee, and he trusted that this statement would be satisfactory to his hon. and gallant Friend, and would prove that he (Mr. Cardwell) had been walking in the direction that the hon. and gallant Gentleman desired. As to the Henry-Martini Committee, that was constituted before he came into Office, and its Report was presented very soon after he took Office; but he believed that a more able, independent, or trustworthy Committee could not have been possibly nominated. Colonel Fletcher was at the head of it, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland sat upon it, and all its other members were persons in every way calculated to inspire respect. His hon. and gallant Friend had said that every Committee of this kind ought to be judicial and not experimental, but that must depend upon circumstances. As far as awarding prizes was concerned the Committee was judicial, but the object of securing the best weapon for the public service could not be attained unless experiments were instituted. They had instituted experiments to ascertain whether any one of the weapons brought before them, or whether the combination of a part of one weapon with a part of another, would be the best for the public service. The result of those experiments was that they adopted the breech of one inventor and the barrel of another, and they recommended the Henry-Martini rifle. The course taken by the Government was to have the Henry-Martini rifle tried at the late Wimbledon meeting. He had not yet received the official Report of that trial, but he believed he was only stating what everybody knew when he said the result had been very successful. That weapon could not be immediately adopted because it must first be tried in India, where some specimens of it were to be sent out for that purpose. With regard to ammunition, the ammunition of Colonel Boxer was generally very satisfactory. It was quite true that there had been recent reports from India which showed that No. 5 ammunition in that country was not in a satisfactory state. He was not yet sufficiently informed of what the extent of the deterioration had been, or whether the cost of destroying any considerable portion of it would be entailed on the Indian Government; but, at all events, the whole amount of the loss would be much less than had been represented to his hon. Friend. But a remedy had been found; the means of excluding chemical action and moisture had already been adopted. With respect to the system of patents, he might say that he had never been a friend or admirer of the Patent Laws, which appeared to him to be open to many of the objections urged against them with great ability in a late debate in that House. But, however that might be, as long as they existed the question would arise whether persons employed in the public Departments, as the heads of public establishments, should be allowed to take up patents. He knew that patents were not binding against the Crown, and that, therefore, no cost need be incurred for them by the public service; but he quite agreed that it was very doubtful whether a public servant at the head of a public manufacturing establishment should be permitted to take up any patent. That opinion he entertained in common with his right hon. Friend at the head of the Board of Admiralty, who had been in correspondence with him for some time on the subject, and they proposed to issue instructions in accordance with that opinion.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that he had known a good deal about these arms in former days, and he had heard something further upon the subject from Birmingham. The great object was to have a tribunal that would satisfy inventors that they would have justice as between each other, and that they would not be exposed to the piracy of their inventions on the part of any of their judges, or of any persons employed by their judges. He had known cases of great hardship, and he had to represent them to predecessors of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, in which cases there had been direct piracy of inventions submitted to the Government for improvements in arms. But a remedy for this was found. General Peel appointed a Committee of officers to give a preliminary judgment upon the arms submitted to them. Now, officers were the proper judges; a soldier ought to know what soldiers wanted. A man who had seen active service was the most likely to know which arm would endure the wear and tear, and what ammunition would be most likely to resist rain, and snow, and heat. If the right hon. Gentleman would revert to that system of General Peel, he would find that the best commencement for establishing an impartial and unsuspected tribunal. He had never known satisfaction so fully given as by the tribunal appointed by General Peel.

Mr. MUNTZ said, that a great amount of discontent existed among the private manufacturers, and he was glad to hear from the Secretary of State for War that in future the taking out of patents by officers or persons connected with the public manufacturing departments would be put an end to. He also hoped that those officers would be prevented from making trials at the public expense in any way for their own advantage. When private manufacturers made discoveries and improved weapons they ought to have some security that the benefit of their discoveries and improvements would not be taken from them.

Mr. SAMUDA said, that in his opinion the moment the Secretary of State parted with the direction of a matter of that sort and handed it over to a Committee composed of members of the constructive departments of the War Office or of any one of the great spending Departments of the State, that moment the right hon. Gentleman and the country were placed in a false position. A question that required a clearer answer than had yet been given to it was this—whether it was possible, seeing the manufacturers were dissatisfied with the judgments of persons interested in the constructive departments of the Government, an independent Committee should not be formed, composed in part of Members of that House?

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Question again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £10,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, including the purchase of Pictures."

Mr. BENTINCK said, that when he complained the other night of the practice of the National Gallery authorities in neglecting to buy pictures when they could be obtained at low prices, and afterwards purchasing them at excessive prices, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Commissioner of Works replied to him in a tone peculiar to himself, denying in a somewhat excited and reckless manner certain statements which he (Mr. Bentinck) had then made. He must repeat that a picture dealer bought at a public auction a couple of pictures for £800, and a few months afterwards sold them to the Government for £1,800; and that another picture had been offered to the Government some years ago, was refused, and then purchased by the Government on the Continent at a high price. Then there was the question of scrubbing, and the reply made to him was in the nature of cross question and crooked answer. He had asked whether a certain picture by Rubens had been scrubbed; and the answer made by the Chief Commissioner was that a picture by Sir Joshua Reynolds and some others had been very well treated. This he granted, but if two or three pictures could be well cleaned, why could not they all be cleaned well? The fact was the Rubens had been in bad hands. He cared little for the opinion of the Attorney General; the facts could not be altered if the whole of the Government one after the other contradicted him, but the Attorney General's answer consisted of an attack on Sir George Beaumont, whose memory, however, would doubtless survive the stroke. The Attorney General had been cited as an authority because he was an accomplished artist. He had the good fortune to possess a work by Sir George Beaumont and another by the Attorney General, and he would be glad to exhibit them side by side and let their authors stand the test. He desired further to put a Question to the Chief Commissioner with reference to Sir Charles Eastlake's library—whether it would be added to any existing Art library or be placed in the National Gallery? He also desired, in the interest of Sir Charles Eastlake's family—as it was said that the pictures of Sir Charles Eastlake were to come to the country for the prices he had paid for them—to inquire what explanation the Government had to offer of the fact that £1,500 was to be paid for one of his pictures, which was bought by him some years ago at a public sale in London for less than £100? One of the pictures attributed to Melozzo da Forli, which had come into the hands of the Government in so extraordinary a manner, and which the Chief Commissioner said had never been in the country before the Government purchased it, was exhibited by the British Institution in Pall Mall in 1863, and was hawked all over London before and after this. For a long time it was exhibited at a temporary studio in the neighbourhood of Oxford Street. It had been offered to a gentleman of his acquaintance. His informant declined the picture on the ground that it was not by the Master to whom it was attributed, and that it was practically valueless on account of the extensive restorations it had undergone. The same informant and others assured him that this and the companion picture had been repaired by Mr. Ugo Baldi, and that a large portion of the works were by his hand. He desired to give to those who represented the Department in the House an opportunity of affording the explanation which the country had a right to expect at their hands; and therefore he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury the Question which stood in his name upon the Paper, and which was as follows:—Whether a picture exhibited in the British Institution, Pall Mall, from June until August 1863, under the following description—"No. 28—Subject: Prince Guidobaldo di Montefeltro, afterwards Duke of Urbino, kneeling before an allegorical figure; painter, Melozzo da Forli; proprietor, W. B. Spence, Esq."—is not one of the two pictures purchased for the National Gallery from Mr. W. Spence, of Florence, during the year 1866, and attributed to Melozzo da Forli?

Mr. AYRTON said, he trusted the Committee would not renew or repeat the discussion which occurred the other night on this subject. They all knew the extreme devotion of the hon. Member to matters of art, but the Committee was now devoted to matters of business—[Mr. Bentinck: And economy]—and economy, if they could effect it. There was no use spending another hour discussing the merits of ancient pictures, and the best mode of varnishing and cleaning them; for he never knew two gentlemen taking an interest in the subject who did not differ in opinion on these points. There was no mystery about the two pictures referred to in the Question. The Report of the Directors of the National Gallery, laid on the table so long ago as February, 1867, contained a very full account of these purchases, which stated very fairly what the pictures were. It did not guarantee them as being the works of the artist, but merely said that they were attributed to him; but the peculiarities of the pictures were described in nearly a page of print. The House had adopted the policy of placing the National Gallery under a Board of Trustees, with a stipendiary Director to assist the Board in the selection of pictures. The reason was that the selection of pictures was an affair of taste, about which everybody differed in opinion. It was perfectly useless for the Committee to discuss the proceedings of those Commissioners for the last half-dozen years, and to raise the question whether they had wisely exercised the powers with which they were invested by law. If the system was a bad one, nothing could be done but to change it altogether. So long as the Commissioners retained their powers, it was obvious the Committee of Supply could only vote the money to enable them to discharge their functions. If, therefore, he did not follow the hon. Member into details, he hoped it would not be supposed that there was any ground for reflecting on the proceedings of the Board, or for suggesting that they had not acted to the best of their judgment.

MR. DISRAELI said, he wished to correct a statement made in his absence the other evening which conveyed a very erroneous impression to the House. The statement originated with the hon. Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Bentinck), who always spoke upon this subject in a manner which deserved attention. The statement was that the authorities of the National Gallery and those of the National Portrait Gallery were in the habit of bidding against each other at public sales. [MR. BENTINCK: I did not say so; I never said that.] However, the general impression was that the statement was made, and it was represented that in consequence of the two institutions competing with each other the country lost the portrait of Hogarth at his easel, painted by himself. As a Trustee of the National Portrait Gallery, and one who took much interest in that institution, he ventured to say there was no foundation whatever for that statement, by whomsoever it was made. It was quite impossible that the trustees of the two institutions could bid against each other, because there subsisted between them the most cordial and confidential understanding, and they always communicated with each other upon a sale of any importance. The portrait of Hogarth at his easel was one which it was desirable the country should possess, and the Trustees of the National Gallery wished to acquire it, but on the whole it was thought that it would be more satisfactory to the country if it were placed in the National Portrait Gallery, and the Trustees of the Portrait Gallery undertook the duty of purchasing it; and they made an offer accordingly of the sum of 355 guineas. That, he believed, was a fair and proper offer; but a gentleman from Manchester defeated the country in this instance, because he was prepared to go to a much larger amount. Those Manchester gentlemen were formidable foes. He was sorry the country lost this interesting picture, but he must congratulate the country on its possession of such high-spirited men as our fellow-citizens of Manchester.

MR. LAYARD said, he must add a word as a Trustee of the National Gallery. The hon. Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Bentinck) was unfortunate in his remarks on this subject, for his hostile criticisms were generally made upon the pictures which were acknowledged to be among the best in the National Gallery. He had spoken of an Italian picture cleaner being employed at the National Gallery, and no one else; but a very eminent English cleaner (Mr. Merritt) was employed at the same time, and had cleaned a Rubens most successfully, removing a mass of brown varnish, and revealing the original colours of the picture. The remarks made respecting Sir Charles Eastlake's pictures were calculated to cause his family great pain. Sir Charles had expressed a wish that the pictures which he had purchased whilst Director of the National Gallery should, after his death, be offered to the nation for the price which he had paid for them. Upon these terms, the Trustees of the National Gallery had acquired some of those pictures. Two other pictures which had belonged to him before his connection with the National Gallery, had been purchased from his widow at their fair market value.

No doubt those pictures had considerably risen in value since the time of their purchase by Sir Charles; but the trustees had no right to call upon his representatives to sell them, except at the price they would fetch in the market.

Mr. BENTINCK said, that he had no intention of making an attack upon the representatives of Sir Charles Eastlake. Everyone knew how the right hon. Gentleman opposite answered statements made in that House, rushing into matters which were totally irrelevant. The Director of the National Gallery was equally answerable with the head of any other Government Department for the conduct of its business, and must submit to have his acts criticized. His complaint was that seven pictures had been injured in cleaning. With regard to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli), he must explain that what he stated on a former occasion was not that two Departments had competed together for the purchase of certain pictures, but that by arrangement one of them had been prevented from competing. The hon. Member (the Secretary to the Treasury) had not answered his question respecting Sir Charles Eastlake's library.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the library in question was to be kept in connection with the National Gallery. It would not be kept open as a public library in the strict sense of the term, on account of the expense that would thereby be entailed; but any person taking an interest in art would be allowed to refer to the works it contained on making application to the gentleman under whose care it was placed.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he would suggest the policy of opening a gallery for the exhibition of collections contributed by private individuals instead of purchasing pictures at the national expense. That course had been adopted in Copenhagen with the best results.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,110, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £8,300, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for Grants in aid of the Expenditure of certain Learned Societies in Great Britain."

Mr. AYRTON, in answer to Questions put by hon. Members, stated that the sum of £10,000 was granted to the Royal Society in consideration of their having undertaken to carry out meteorological observations.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he hoped that some assistance would be given to the Royal Geographical Society, which rendered valuable assistance to the Government.

Mr. MILLER said, he must object to the Royal Society receiving £10,000 per annum, while the Meteorological Society of Scotland received nothing in exchange for the information with which they furnished the Government.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that the Royal Society only received the £10,000 per annum as trustees, having to expend it for the purposes of the Government. No part of it was applied to their own requirements.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, he would remind the Committee that the Royal Society now made meteorological observations which had formerly been made by the Department of the Board of Trade, and that the society had undertaken this duty for the convenience of the Government.

Mr. MONK asked why a sum of £500 for the Royal Academy of Music had been re-introduced in the Votes?

Mr. D. DALRYMPLE said, there were increased demands on the scientific societies, and he did not think the contributions made by the State to the funds of those societies were at all too liberal.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought the Committee ought to have some explanation on the subject of the re-introduction of the Vote of £500 for the Royal Academy of Music, which was discontinued several years ago. He would be the last man to object to any well-spent outlay for the cultivation of music; but he thought there was much reason to doubt whether this Vote to the Royal Academy was a really useful one.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the mercantile interests of the entire kingdom benefited by the observations of the Royal Society. There were accounts to show how all the money voted to that society was spent. The Geographical Society had lost the house accommodation with which the nation had provided them in consequence of the building operations going on in Piccadilly; and the Government could not undertake to supply that society with another hall. The Royal Academy of Music had received a Vote for several years. During the last two years that Vote had been withdrawn, probably owing to the expenses of the Abyssinian War. The question was, whether the Vote should be revived. The Academy wanted a building for its accommodation, and Her Majesty's Government thought that the Vote ought to be renewed, so that the Academy might be kept alive. But since the Government had arrived at that conclusion there had been an expression of opinion by a portion of the musical world against the Vote, and, in consequence of that opinion, the Government would carefully consider the question whether the Vote should be asked for in future.

MR. BENTINCK said, that, though music was the science of harmony, there was no profession among the members of which there was greater discord than that which existed among the professors of music. He was authorized to say that the Vote would be of great use to the Academy, which was the only society which gave musical instruction to poor people at a cheap rate. Many of the members of the Covent Garden orchestra had received their musical education from the Academy.

MR. MONK said, he did not think a good case had been made out for the Vote to the Royal Academy of Music. He accordingly moved that the Vote be reduced by £500.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £500, for the Royal Academy of Music, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Monk,*)

DR. BREWER said, that £500 was a very trifling matter to the State, but it would be a serious loss to the Academy of Music. Its existence was of great advantage to young women with a taste for music; and it had enjoyed the favour of former Sovereigns, George IV. especially having invited the Academy to play before him during his illness.

MR. MUNTZ said, he would vote the £500 if it were understood to be a gift. But any hon. Member who had taken the trouble to go through the Estimates for the last thirty years, as he had done, would be astonished to find how every item had grown, so that we had exactly trebled our expenditure in that time.

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he thought it would be hardly fair to stop the £500 this year, as the Academy must have expected to receive it.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he must point out that the Academy had not received the Vote for the last two years. At the same time he had no objection to grant £500, or £5,000, if it were proved first that the Academy required it, and next that it filled that place in the estimation of the musical world which it ought to do. What assurance had they at present that the Academy was worthy of its name?

MR. WHITWORTH said, that according to the statement of the Secretary to the Treasury, that Department had undertaken to see to the proper distribution of the Vote. The ordinary course was to vote money for a purpose clearly defined and ascertained beforehand.

MR. M'LAREN said, he remembered perfectly well that two or three years ago, when this subject was last discussed, it was agreed to drop the Academy of Music out of the Votes. He wanted to know what change of circumstances had induced the Treasury to put it in again?

MR. AYRTON said, the Vote was an exceptional one, merely to assist the Academy to meet the exigencies of the year, arising out of the necessity of a change of residence. It had been distinctly understood that the Vote was not to be continuous, and power had been reserved to the Government of investigating thoroughly the condition of the Academy, with a view of ascertaining how far it fulfilled the wishes and expectations of the musical world.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £6,449, to complete the sum for the University of London.

(5.) £12,337, to complete the sum for the Scottish Universities.

(6.) £2,100, to complete the sum for the Board of Manufactures (Scotland).

MR. M'LAREN said, he thought that the salary of £300 a year paid to the Secretary was excessive, seeing that the same gentleman received £520 yearly as Secretary to the Fishery Board. He thought it was a great abuse and waste of the public money that the son of a Peer should hold both these appointments.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, no complaint had ever been made of the manner in which the gentleman in question performed his duties.

Mr. BENTINCK said, he observed in the detailed account of this Vote an item of £1,000 for the purchase of pictures. He should be glad of an explanation.

Mr. AYRTON said, as to the question of salary, no doubt the item appeared large; but he feared it was not open to the Government to re-consider the amount till the office fell vacant, without paying this gentleman a considerable sum for compensation. As regarded the pictures, the Vote was one enabling them to be purchased, and would be administered by the Board of Manufactures, subject, however, to this restriction, that to meet the amount voted by the State an equal amount must be raised by local contributions. How they might exercise their taste he could not undertake to say.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £1,240, to complete the sum for the National Gallery (Ireland).

(8.) £1,084, to complete the sum for the Royal Irish Academy.

(9.) £1,710, to complete the sum for the Queen's University (Ireland).

(10.) £2,865, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges (Ireland).

(11.) £1,250, to complete the sum for the Belfast Theological Professors, &c.

(12.) £9,298, to complete the sum for the Fishery Board (Scotland).

(13.) £5,391, to complete the sum for the General Register Office (Scotland).

(14.) £4,166, to complete the sum for the Lunacy Board (Scotland).

(15.) £9,838, to complete the sum for the Poor Law Administration (Scotland).

Mr. AYRTON, in reply to Mr. Monk, stated that the considerable increase in the amount incurred for salaries in connection with this Department had arisen from the appointment of stipendiary officers, whose duty it was to see that the provisions of the Public Health Act were

Mr. M'Laren

properly carried out, that Act having been extended to Scotland.

Vote *agreed to.*

(16.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £3,664, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for Expenses of the Lord Lieutenant's Household."

Mr. RYLANDS *moved* that the Vote be reduced by £1,562 6*s.* 2*d.*, the amount granted for Queen's Plates.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £1,562 6*s.* 2*d.*, for Queen's Plates in Ireland, be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Rylands.*)

Mr. Serjeant DOWSE said, he thought that the Motion ought not to be persisted in, seeing that the opponents of the granting of Queen's Plates to Scotland were beaten on a division by two to one. He had supported the Vote in reference to Scotland, knowing what his Friends below the Gangway had in store for Ireland.

Mr. AYRTON said, he trusted that his hon. Friend would not divide the Committee on this Vote. A large stud was maintained by the Crown in England, and these Plates were originally granted to Scotland and Ireland under the impression that they might in some degree be regarded as an equivalent. The arguments against the Queen's Plates in Ireland were equally strong in the case of Scotland, and as the opponents of the Vote had in that case been beaten, he trusted that they would not oppose the Vote now.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that the hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Treasury had furnished sufficient argument to induce his hon. Friend the Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands) to persist in his Motion. The hon. Gentleman had defended this Vote, not on the ground that it was good in itself, but on the ground that these plates being granted in England, it was necessary they should also be given to Ireland. If the Committee had no opportunity of dividing on these grants in the case of England this year, he would take care that they were afforded an opportunity next Session.

Mr. HUNT said, he would beg to ask the hon. Gentleman opposite to explain what Vote connected with England it was that he referred to?

MR. AYRTON replied that the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) had mistaken his argument. What he had said was that the Vote having been granted in the case of Scotland, it would not be fair to refuse it in the case of Ireland. There was a considerable expense incurred in England in connection with horses as part of the Royal state and dignity, and this expenditure was supposed to improve the breed of horses. These Plates were given as an equivalent, not for the purpose, as some hon. Gentlemen appeared to imagine, of encouraging racing, but for the purpose of encouraging the breeding and improvement in the breed of horses. That was the view of the Vote which was taken at its establishment.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that the expenditure alluded to by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) as being incurred in this country did not appear in the Estimates, but came out of the Civil List, and did not, therefore, in any way prove the validity of his argument.

MR. COGAN said, he thought that any hon. Member who was about to propose the reduction of a Vote ought to give notice of his intention. The hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) was so fond of dividing in minorities that he should never dream of appealing to him not to divide; but he trusted the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) would not take the sense of the House after the decision which had been given on a former occasion. It was a great advantage to the country that the breeding of horses should be encouraged.

MR. LIDDELL said, that he should vote for the grant of this money because he desired to place Ireland on a footing of equality with the other portions of the United Kingdom.

MR. P. WYKEHAM MARTIN said, a smaller sum used to be voted for this purpose in England until the late Sir John Shelley persuaded the House to strike it out of the Estimates on the ground that the Royal stud was not only self-supporting, but even a profitable concern. If, then, the English Vote had been disallowed, why should the Irish Vote be agreed to?

MR. PIM said, that he should vote in favour of the reduction, as he had on a previous occasion adopted a similar course with regard to Scotland. One division was surely enough on this subject.

MR. HUNT said, that the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Ayrton) need not be alarmed on the score of inequality between the two countries, as the Report of Supply had not yet been brought up.

MR. ANDERSON said, he was of opinion that if the Queen's Plates in England came out of the Civil List the expense of those for Ireland and Scotland ought to be likewise defrayed from the same source.

Question put,

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 59; Noes 79: Majority 20.

MR. CRAUFURD said, he rose to move to report Progress. He had a complaint to make against Her Majesty's Government. He had placed a Notice on the Paper to the effect that he intended to object to certain items of the Vote respecting the Fishery Board of Scotland, and he had come down to the House expressly to bring forward his Motion. That Vote had been taken. He had given notice of his intention to move to reduce Vote 30, Class II., for the Scotch Fishery Board, by £5,766 13*s.* 5*d.* The Notice placed on the Paper by the Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Ayrton) was that Class IV. would be taken, and after Class IV., Class II. Shortly before midnight, he made an inquiry respecting that Vote of a Friend of his, the hon. Baronet the Member for Fife (Sir Robert Anstruther), who took the same interest in the matter that he (Mr. Craufurd) took, and he was informed by him that the result of an inquiry addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury had been an assurance that Class II. of the Votes would not be taken that night, as the intention was to proceed with Class IV. Now, if it had not been for the fact that he had had a letter to write he should have left the House. His hon. Friend the Member for Fife would also have gone away, but fortunately the Lord Advocate was good enough to go and inform him that the Vote was on. Now, he complained that, instead of going on with Class IV., Class II. was taken, when public notice had been given that objection was to be taken to the Vote for the Scotch Fishery Board in that Class. What was done? The hon. Baronet the Member for Fife and himself had scarcely turned their backs, having been informed that Class II. would not come on, when Class IV. was put aside, and Class II. was brought on behind their backs, and passed without comment. He thought he had a right to complain of such conduct on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and especially on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, who told his hon. Friend the Member for Fife that he would not take Class II. of the Estimates that night. He begged to move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Craufurd.*)

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he was quite prepared to confirm everything that had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Ayr (Mr. Craufurd). They remained there the whole evening in order that they might be present when the Scotch Votes came on. He went to the Secretary of the Treasury about forty or forty-five minutes ago, and asked him whether the Scotch Votes were to be taken that night, as he was anxious to know; and he told him distinctly that the Scotch Votes would not be taken.

Mr. BLAKE said, he had also been anxious to make some observations on the Vote for the Scotch Fishery Board, not with a view to oppose it, but to show to the Chancellor of the Exchequer—who would not lend £10,000 to keep the Irish fisheries alive until they could get a portion of the surplus funds of the Irish Church—what a gross injustice was done to Ireland by giving Scotland £7,000 more than Ireland.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was exceedingly sorry that the smallest misunderstanding should have arisen about the progress of the Committee of Supply. He was constantly asked by hon. Members as to what would be the probable course of business, and he gave them the best estimate he could of the time that was likely to be taken up by particular matters. If any hon. Gentleman construed such an estimate into an engagement that certain business should not be proceeded with, all he could say was that he was very sorry for it, because he only gave the best opinion he could as to how far the Committee were likely to go. He thought it was generally understood that they would not that night take the Irish Education Vote—the only Vote passed over in Class IV. When he asked the Committee whether it would not object to go on with Class II., he was not in the least under the impression that any hon. Gentleman interested had left the House. If, however, any hon. Member had lost an opportunity of questioning any Vote, he would promise him that the Report should be brought up at a time when it could be freely and fully discussed. If the Committee did not now wish to proceed any further, Progress could be reported. ["Go on."] But it was desirable, if such was the pleasure of the Committee, to finish Class II. that night.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would beg to inquire what Classes of Supply would be taken at the Morning Sitting to-morrow, and what Classes in the evening?

Mr. AYRTON said, he proposed at the Morning Sitting to take the Irish Education Votes in Class IV., and then proceed in the ordinary course with Class III. If they got into Supply at the Evening Sitting he wished to resume exactly at the point where they might have left off at the end of the Morning Sitting.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, he must be allowed to say that he was not satisfied with the explanation which the Secretary of the Treasury had just given, and he should accept no assurance from the hon. Member. He must have the assurance of a Minister of the Crown. ["Oh, oh!"] Otherwise, he should refuse to withdraw the Motion for reporting Progress. He could not help thinking that he had been "jockeyed" out of his opportunity. ["Oh!" *and* "Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN said, he rose to Order. He must ask the hon. Member to withdraw that expression.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, if the expression he had used was un-Parliamentary he would withdraw it; but, he must say, that he thought he had been treated unfairly in the matter. No opportunity which might be afforded him on the Report would put him in the position which he would have occupied in Committee of Supply.

Mr. BRUCE explained that no promise had been given by his hon. Friend the Secretary of the Treasury to postpone the Scotch Votes. His hon. Friend had explained that they had arrived at a point when it was inconvenient to proceed with the important Vote for National Education in Ireland, and the Committee consented to proceed with Class II. of the Estimates. He thought it unnecessary to renew the assurance which had already been given by his hon. Friend the Secretary of the Treasury, that the hon. Member for Ayr (Mr. Craufurd) would have on the Report a convenient opportunity of stating his views with respect to the Scotch Fisheries Vote.

MR. AYRTON said, he must be allowed to say one word in explanation. He thought that when the hon. Member for the Ayr Burghs spoke with such extreme certainty as to what took place, he should remember the fact that he was speaking not of anything within his own knowledge, because he did not suggest that he had any connection with him (Mr. Ayrton); and when observations made by him passed through other channels, it was quite possible that, without the smallest desire on the part of any person to mislead, there might have arisen a misapprehension as to what took place.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, as he was the channel referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman, through which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Ayr Burghs might have been mistaken, he was bound to say that there was not the slightest misapprehension on his part as to what took place. It was quite possible that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not mean him (Sir Robert Anstruther) to understand that the Scotch Votes would not be proceeded with to-night; but all he could say was, that upon the faith of what he stated, he informed his hon. Friend that the Vote which he, in common with himself, had been waiting for for a great many hours would not come on.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, he wished distinctly to understand what they were going to do to-morrow. It was generally understood that the first business would be the Irish Church Bill, and after that the Metropolitan Poor Law Amendment Bill. He desired to know whether that was to be the Order of Business.

MR. CARDWELL said, it was certainly intended to take the Irish Church Bill as the first Order at two o'clock if the printer should have finished his work, but if not the first Order would be Committee of Supply.

MR. HUNT said, if at one o'clock in the morning the Government did not feel certain that the printer would be ready, they ought to say that the Irish Church Bill would not be taken first.

MR. CARDWELL said, it was the intention of the Government to proceed with the Irish Church Bill first, and it was their hope that it would be ready.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, he wished to know when the Metropolitan Poor Law Amendment Bill would come on?

MR. GOSCHEN said, it was impossible for him to give any pledge on the subject.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BOWRING said, he wished to know what was the meaning of "two gentleman at large," whose salaries formed an item in the Vote?

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE replied that these were gentleman attached, at a small salary to the Viceregal Court, and adorning it. There was nothing at all novel about the matter.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(17.) £15,453, to complete the sum for the Chief Secretary's Offices.

(18.) £100, to complete the sum for the Boundary Survey (Ireland).

(19.) £1,238, to complete the sum for the Charitable Donations and Bequests Office (Ireland).

(20.) £13,722, to complete the sum for the General Register Office, &c. (Ireland).

(21.) £65,328, to complete the sum for the Poor Law Commission (Ireland).

(22.) £3,182, to complete the sum for the Public Record Office (Ireland).

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £18,196, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

MR. BLAKE said, he must ask that the Vote might be postponed, as he was prepared, if there was time, to show, that there was the most wasteful and wanton extravagance in connection with the Board of Works, and that there was general dissatisfaction as to the manner in which the business was carried on.

Mr. AYRTON said, he could assure his hon. Friend that if he were to communicate with him he should have every assistance in promoting the economy and efficiency which he desired in the Board of Works, and that would be better than postponing the Vote.

Mr. WHITWELL said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would move to report Progress, as there were several items in the Vote which required explanation.

Mr. BLAKE *moved* to report Progress.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*
Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS [JULY 12.] REPORTED.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he must again refer to the recent changes in the establishment of the Office of Works, and would base his remarks on the correspondence between the Chief Commissioner of Works and the Treasury, which had been presented to Parliament on his (Mr. Sclater-Booth's) Motion. It appeared that the original proposition of the Chief Commissioner had not worked well, and the net result seemed to be that a valuable public servant had been exchanged for a gentleman of reputation and ability, with an increase of the establishment and not an increase in efficiency. Then it appeared that Mr. Pennethorne's office had been abolished; but, while his salary appeared on the Estimates for twelve months only, it was understood he was to receive £3,000 for work done, which did not appear on the Estimates in any shape. Mr. Hunt, a most able surveyor, appeared on the Estimates as drawing a salary of £750, but in some way this was to be made up to £1,000. He trusted the Government would be able to offer some explanation of these points.

Mr. LAYARD said, the hon. Gentleman had given a singularly unfair version of the matter. The arrangement which he at first proposed was not carried out. It was that the distribution of coals, candles, and furniture should be taken away from the Department, that the assistant secretary should be dispensed with, and that there should be a financial secretary and one for works and buildings. The Treasury, however, thought it right not to take away the distribution of coals, candles, and furniture from the office, and the amount of business, therefore, thrown on the secretary led to an inquiry by a Committee, who recommended the continuation of the appointment of an assistant secretary. It would have been well if the hon. Gentleman, who had so suddenly appeared in the character of a financial reformer, had done something when in Office to check reckless and scandalous expenditure on the new Foreign Office, Burlington House, and other buildings, for it appeared there was not a single person in the Office of Works to check any part of the enormous outlay on those buildings. Mr. Pennethorne was a practising architect, and was receiving 5 per cent on every 1*s.* which he expended. The system was a bad one which led to the employment of Mr. Pennethorne to check the expenditure upon buildings which he himself was erecting for the Government. Thinking it necessary to have some disinterested person attached to the office to give advice to the Chief Commissioner, he selected Mr. Fergusson, whose appointment had given general satisfaction, who had already effected a large saving to the public, and who, if appointed some years ago, would have prevented much scandalous and extravagant expenditure. With increased efficiency in the Office there was no addition to the expenditure. Mr. Pennethorne would be able to compete like any other architect for the erection of public buildings, and would be remunerated by a percentage.

Mr. HUNT said, that in Committee of Supply he remarked that the circumstances of the case were very peculiar, correspondence which had been promised three months not having been produced, and the production of the correspondence had borne out the remark he made. In so simple a matter there never were so many blunders made by two Departments. When the right hon. Gentleman (the Chief Commissioner of Works) came into Office there were a secretary, an under secretary, and an assistant; and Mr. Austin, the secretary, an old public servant, was anxious to retire. Before he had been in Office many days the right hon. Gentleman recommended that there should be a Secretary of Works and Buildings, but the right hon. Gentleman and the person appointed had different opinions as to what were the duties of the office. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer found the new arrangements would not work, and recommended a Committee of Inquiry; and no doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer was right. The Committee recommended that the arrangement so harshly interrupted should be restored; but the new Secretary of Works and Buildings could not be got rid of, and as there was an officer too many, Mr. Pennethorne, a valuable public officer, must be made the victim. He was to be discarded to make room for this new Secretary of Works and Buildings imported by the right hon. Gentleman. It was proposed that he should be discarded at the end of six months, and that his salary should be taken only for that term on the Estimates; but it was found that Mr. Pennethorne had works in hand which would occupy him much longer than six months, and it was felt that it would be treating him unhandsomely to give him less salary than he had been receiving. How the money was to be found to pay Mr. Pennethorne for his services he was at a loss to know. The Committee was scarcely treated with frankness when it was told that Mr. Henry Hunt's salary was to be reduced from £1,000 to £750, and it was not stated that he was to be recouped by commission. [Mr. LAYARD: I stated it the other night.] All he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say was that Mr. Hunt had handsomely waived a quarter of his salary. He did not understand the official reply then given in the sense in which it was now interpreted. There was no intimation, certainly, that Mr. Pennethorne's services were to be retained for a year and a-half at a cost of £3,000. The correspondence ended with a request from Mr. Pennethorne that it would be stated that he left the service with honour. The answer given to that request had not been communicated to Parliament, but he hoped that Mr. Pennethorne would be satisfied, and that testimony would be borne to his official services. The right hon. Gentleman had sought to turn upon the Conservative Government responsibility for the expenditure upon the Foreign Office. But when the plans for that building were under consideration, and the nation was practically committed to the expenditure, who were the Ministers at the Foreign Office? Why, Earl Russell was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the right hon. Gentleman now the Chief Commissioner of Works was his Under Secretary. Even supposing that the officials primarily interested in the character of the new building had favoured extravagance of design, whose business was it to check them and keep them within reasonable compass? Why, the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown, who then was the Chancellor of the Exchequer. To hear the right hon. Gentleman opposite endeavour, under these circumstances, to fix responsibility for this expenditure upon the Conservative Government, was a proposition so extraordinary that one could hardly refrain from laughter. Before the right hon. Gentleman sanctioned other changes in public Departments, he hoped they would be preceded by careful inquiry, so that they might not again have such an exhibition as was contained in this correspondence.

MR. AYRTON said, he hoped the discussion would not be carried on with any acrimony. The Government had laid upon the table all the details affecting an important and useful change in a public Department, but naturally a minute history of any such change must disclose the fact that views from day to day had changed or modified. Economy and advantages were expected to follow from the change, as well as the removal of much inconvenience that was now felt, for without reflecting upon Mr. Pennethorne, or any other gentleman, the fact remained that a state of affairs existed which prevented the Department from being efficient for its purpose. It was the price paid for all improvements in the public service that there was always at first considerable difficulty, as well as apparently an increase of expenditure. There had not been the slightest desire to keep back anything from the House of Commons. The Papers could not be produced at an earlier date, and the discussion upon the Vote itself had been taken expressly upon the condition that those Papers would be produced upon the Report, a pledge which had now been fulfilled.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, he wished to ask what were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with reference to filling up the vacant appointment of Queen's Remembrancer in Scotland? It was often said that Scotland was governed by the Lord Advocate and the Queen's Remembrancer, and he was sure that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate must have been greatly inconvenienced by the vacancy which had existed in the office of his Colleague for so many months; and he trusted that the intentions of the Government in reference to the appointment would be made known to the House.

MR. AYRTON said, he wished to state that Her Majesty's Government were fully alive to the great importance of this office, and that had been the reason why no step had been taken to fill it up; because it had been necessary to consider very carefully what should be done in regard to it, with a view to a number of questions which are now pending, and have reference to the future administration of affairs in Scotland. As soon as Her Majesty's Government had arrived at a conclusion on the subject, they would deal with the office; but he must remind the hon. Member that there had been subjects of great moment engaging the attention of the Government for some time past, and they had not, in consequence, been able to arrive at a conclusion in regard to this office.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he did not wish to cavil at the answer just given by the hon. and learned Gentleman, but the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) had stated distinctly that, on the Report, he would be prepared to say whether Her Majesty's Government would fill up the vacant office or not.

MR. STANSFELD said, his hon. Friend was perfectly right; and if the Prime Minister was in his place, he would be prepared to make the statement, because it was upon his instructions that he gave the answer he had referred to.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) (No. 2) BILL—[BILL 226.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. William Edward Foster, Mr. Secretary Bruce.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. CHADWICK said, he hoped the people of Macclesfield would have an opportunity of bringing the case of Cheshire under the consideration of the House next Session.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

VOLUNTEER ACT (1863) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Captain VIVIAN, Bill to amend the Volunteer Act, 1863, *ordered* to be brought in by Captain VIVIAN and Mr. Secretary CARDWELL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 236.]

IRISH CHURCH BILL.

Ordered, That the Commons Amendments to the Lords Amendments to the Irish Church Bill, and the Reasons for disagreeing to several of the Lords Amendments, be *printed.* [Bill 232.]—(*Mr. Walpole.*)

ACCOUNTS, &C. PRESENTATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. AYRTON, Bill to amend the Law relating to the presentation of Accounts, Statements, Returns, and Documents to Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. AYRTON and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 23rd July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds * (215); Cinque Ports Act Amendment * (216); Contagious Diseases (Animals) * (217); Contagious Diseases * (221).

Second Reading—Prevention of Gaming (Scotland * (206); Debts of Deceased Persons * (169).

Committee — Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2) * (205).

Committee — Report — High Constables' Office Abolition, &c. * (99).

Report—Endowed Schools * (192-220); Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland) * (180); Fines and Fees Collection * (155); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) * (183).

Third Reading—Assessed Rates * (174); Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland) * (175); Seamen's Clothing * (189); Queen Anne's Bounty (Superannuation Allowances) * (185), and *passed.*

IRISH CHURCH BILL.

Returned from the Commons, with the amendments made by the Lords to the amendments made by the Commons to the amendments made by the Lords, and the consequential amendment, *agreed to;* and the amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons had disagreed and on which the Lords have insisted, *agreed to.*

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, I have to lay on the table certain despatches lately received from the Governor General of India on the construction of railways in that country, together with the reply which, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, I have made to the Government of India with reference to that important question. The construction of railways has so important a bearing on the subject of the finances of our Indian Empire that I have thought this a convenient opportunity for fulfilling the pledge which I gave the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) at an early period of the Session that I would make a statement with regard to those finances. The "Indian Budget" is a term altogether inapplicable to the financial statements made from time to time to the British Parliament by Secretaries of State for India. The British Parliament does not authorize the expenditure in India nor vote the Indian taxes, the estimate of expenditure and income for the year being made by the Finance Minister in India before the Legislative Council there. All that could be done here is to give an explanation of the state of matters brought before the Indian Legislature. I do not propose to trouble your Lordships at any length with the statement of the Budget for the current year, because to those who do not remember the pre-existing state of Indian finance, the figures for the present year have little significance. I shall state very shortly the Estimate for the current year; but I am most anxious to give the House an idea of the state of Indian finance by placing before them a comparison of the last year for which we have completed accounts with the beginning of the last decennial period. The last year for which we are in possession of completed accounts is the year 1867-8, the tenth since the Mutiny; and, in order to give an idea of the general progress of Indian finance, I propose to compare the revenue and expenditure of that tenth year since the Mutiny, with the year preceding the Mutiny. I shall then state the regular Estimate for 1868-9, and the Budget Estimate for 1869-70. I will first state the increase of revenue arising from our Indian Empire since the Mutiny—that is, compare the revenue of 1856-7 with the revenue of 1867-8. In the year immediately preceding the Mutiny the revenue stood at £33,378,026; whereas the revenue for 1867-8 stood at £48,534,412; in other words there has been an increase in the ten years of £15,156,386, or 45½ per cent on the whole revenue of the Indian Empire. First of all, in the excise there is an increase of £1,318,581, due to an additional duty on distilleries; and in assessed taxes an increase of £653,848, due to the imposition of a new tax, the license tax, which is substantially a modified income tax. Customs show an increase of £1,380,735, arising from a revised tariff, but not generally from increased duties; on the salt tax there is an increase of £2,133,037, a large portion of it being due to increased duties; and stamps of £1,573,481; while the electric telegraph, a new item, amounts to £241,947; thus showing that of the whole £15,000,000 of increase, £7,301,620 is due to sources of revenue on which there has been increased or new taxation. Turning next to that portion of the increase not due to this cause, the land revenue shows an increase of £2,083,727; opium of £3,912,043; the post office of £399,487; law and justice of £667,108; marine of £295,573, and miscellaneous of £707,714. These items of increase are peculiarly satisfactory, especially the increase in the customs duties, since concurrently with this increase in the total receipts there has been a very large reduction in the duties levied immediately after the Mutiny. There has been very much the same process, indeed, in India as in this country of diminishing the number of articles on which duties are levied, and in many cases of reducing the rates levied on those articles. Generally speaking, the tariff stood before the Mutiny at 5 per cent, with some exceptional classes at 3½ to 10 per cent;

cotton piece-goods being at 5 per cent, and cotton thread, twist, and yarn at 3½ per cent. Now, on fifty-five classes out of sixty-six the duty is 7½ per cent, including cotton thread, but cotton twist and cotton piece-goods are still at 3½ and 5 per cent respectively. The land revenue has increased in all the provinces of India, and this is peculiarly satisfactory, because it is going on concurrently with more moderate assessment and a lower rate. In some cases we do not now take more than 50 per cent from the net produce of the soil, whereas in former times upwards of 66 per cent was taken. This shows, then, a pretty steady increase in the land revenue. In the Punjaub the increase is £112,000; in Madras, £412,000; in Bombay, £710,000; in Bengal, £282,000; and in Oude, £362,000. No doubt one of the minor causes of the increase is that we have had, to a certain extent, confiscated estates subsequent to the Mutiny, and we have had the resumption of rent-free estates also to a small extent; but, as far as I can make out, some £250,000 would fully account for the whole increase due to these sources, and the rest of the increase must be attributed to the increase of cultivation and the general prosperity of the people. With regard to opium, which stands at a very high figure, I find that in the ten years since the Mutiny, the net receipts from opium have risen from £3,861,045 to £7,049,447, being an increase of £3,188,402. It may be interesting to your Lordships to have a short statement of the increase of Indian trade during the same period, which is also peculiarly satisfactory as showing the progress of the property of the Empire. The imports in the year before the Mutiny were—£28,608,284, while in 1866-7 they were—£44,291,496; showing an increase of £15,683,212. The exports in the year before the Mutiny were—£26,591,877, while they now stand at £50,202,777; showing an increase of £23,610,900. To the increase in the imports cotton goods contribute £8,247,960, and cotton twist and yarn £1,488,152; metals for the purpose of railway construction figure very largely, contributing also. As regards exports it is satisfactory to find that the export of raw cotton has increased from £1,437,949 before the Mutiny to £19,756,489, the increase being £18,318,540; and that the export of grain has also nearly doubled, having increased from £2,587,456 to £4,168,935; the increase being £1,581,479. With regard to agricultural produce, including seeds for the purpose of making oil, wool, coffee, tea, and jute, these have increased since the Mutiny by £22,358,887. This, remember, is a comparison of two ordinary normal years, and it by no means gives an adequate idea of the resources of our Indian Empire as regards production, when there are any unusual circumstances stimulating production, for, in 1865-6, during the American War, the imports increased from £28,608,000 to £56,156,000; and the exports from £26,591,000 to £67,656,000; of which raw cotton alone accounts for £34,000,000, and grain for £2,660,000. This increase of exports and imports is a most satisfactory indication, not only of the existing trade of the country, but of its enormous resources, whenever any extraordinary circumstances bring high prices to bear to stimulate production. The postal increase is another gratifying item, for the letters and newspapers received for delivery have increased from 37,260,000 to 67,978,000. Before passing to items of expenditure, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement which has been made in this country that our Indian Empire has for a great many years been in a state of chronic deficit. This is an inaccurate statement of the facts of the case. There was, of course, an enormous deficit in the year of the Mutiny, and for four or five years afterwards there was also a very large deficit; but of the seven years which succeeded 1861, when the Mutiny deficits came to an end, three have shown either small deficits or an actual surplus. In 1861-2 the deficit was the nominal one of £50,000; in 1863-4, there was a surplus of £78,000; in 1864-5, there was a deficit of only £193,000; while, in 1862-3, there was a surplus of £1,800,000; in 1865-6, one of £2,766,000; this last being partly due to a mere question of account, but partly also to a large increase in the opium revenue. The year 1866-7 was altogether exceptional, only eleven months being taken, owing to a change in the system of accounts; and in 1867-8 there was a deficit of £1,000,000

I now proceed to give an account of the expenditure for 1867-8. The revenue, as I have already stated, being £48,534,412; the expenditure was

£49,542,107, leaving a deficit of a little more than £1,000,000. This increase of expenditure, which is a little more than the increase of revenue, arises, in the first place, from the military expenditure in India and in England. Exclusive of military buildings, the army showed an increase of £1,863,625 in India; and £1,457,755 in England; making a total of £3,321,380. Together with this there is an increase in the police force of £1,341,085; making for the internal defence of India an increase of £4,662,465. In public works the increase of expenditure during the same period was £1,943,689; and in the charges connected with the collection of the revenue, £2,180,483. Law and justice stand for £824,980; science and education for £536,903; superanuation and retiring allowances £548,044; interest on the increase of debt, since the Mutiny, £2,684,408; and, lastly, the loss on the guaranteed interest to railway companies over and above the traffic returns, which is £1,136,238; thus accounting for £14,500,000 out of the total increase of £15,000,000. The other items are such as are not easily classified. I will now refer to one or two of the items on which an enormous increase has arisen. First, as to the army. Before the Mutiny the number of European troops was 45,522 and the Native army numbered 249,153; making a total of 294,675; the cost being £12,781,916; while the police force cost only £1,093,040; so that the total cost of the army and police was £13,874,956. There are now 64,704 Europeans and 122,984 Natives, a total of 197,688 men, at a cost of £16,054,061 for the army, and £2,374,290 for the police, showing a total of £18,428,351; or an increase on the year before the Mutiny of £4,553,395. Lord Canning, before he left India, estimated that when the immediate exigencies of the Mutiny should have passed away the cost of the army and police would be £15,266,378, whereas it has been £18,428,351—showing, therefore, that the military expenditure for India was not only very much in excess of what it stood at before the Mutiny, but also considerably in excess of what Lord Canning estimated for the necessities of our Indian Empire. Perhaps it may not be thought quite fair to compare the expense of the army with its expense before the Mutiny, because undoubtedly everyone believed that the expense of a much larger European army must necessarily be greater. It is, perhaps, fairer, therefore, to compare the military expenditure of last year with the lowest point to which it has been reduced since the Mutiny—namely, 1863-4, when the expense was reduced to £14,546,410; it now stands at £16,054,061, being an increase of £1,507,651, in addition to an increase in the cost of military buildings of nearly £1,000,000, to which I shall afterwards refer. I have endeavoured to ascertain the causes of this very large increase, with the view of seeing whether any reduction could be made, and I have directed the attention of Lord Mayo and the Government of India very earnestly to the question whether considerable economy might not be carried out in the military expenditure. A considerable portion of the increased cost can, however, be satisfactorily accounted for. I find from the speech of Sir Richard Temple, the Finance Minister for India, in the Indian Council in the early part of the year, that much of this increased expense has arisen from the necessity of giving increased pay and better clothing to the troops. Then there is a considerable increase on account of providing for the wives and families of a larger number of married soldiers. A third cause is the increased pay to Native troops; a fourth, a large increase in the cost of the medical staff; a fifth, the extension of batta; a sixth, the cost of Staff corps; and a seventh, compensation to Native troops for the great rise in the price of provisions in India. These various causes are calculated by Sir Richard Temple to account for an increase of £950,000. Then there are the following causes of increase in England, owing to the very much larger number of European troops kept in India. The cost of transport of troops has increased by £255,713, the charges for recruiting by £420,231, the retired pay pensions and furlough allowances by £460,199; thus accounting for an increase of £1,136,143. There remains another £1,000,000 for which I confess I am unable to account, and I earnestly trust that, the attention of the Government having been directed to the point, some economy may be effected both in England and in India with regard to the military expenditure required for the latter. With regard to recruiting, a joint Committee is now sitting on behalf of the War Office and the India Office, and I hope that the result of their labours may be a considerable reduction in the cost; for I cannot help expressing an opinion that the increase in the cost of recruiting is inordinately large, and that a considerable saving may be effected. The expenses of law and justice account for an increase of £741,798, which is satisfactorily accounted for by such items as the establishment of a new system of registration, which is likely to pay for its own cost—the multiplication of small cause courts in the Mofussil and other districts, the very large outlay on gaols and prisons, the administration of justice in the Punjaub and Oude, and the increased salaries of Judges. I now come to another formidable item of the increased charge on the Indian revenue —the interest on the increasing amount of debt. The total amount of debt raised since the Mutiny is £50,425,000; but £7,648,000 having been paid off, the net increase, at the end of 1868, was £42,777,000. The whole debt of India immediately before the Mutiny stood at £53,489,115, while now it stands, I am sorry to say, at £96,251,543, the average rate of interest on the whole being £4 13*s*. 8*d*. per cent. A very large portion of the debt being raised during the difficulties of the Mutiny, when our credit was considerably damaged, the rate of interest was higher than it would otherwise have been; but our recent loans have been raised on very favourable terms—namely, in England at only 4 per cent, and in India at 4½. The total increased charge due to this increase of debt is £2,305,000. The state of our Indian credit is extremely satisfactory, being better than any of the great European States, for France, I believe, pays something more than 4 per cent on its national debt. Another large item of increase is the loss on the guaranteed railways; for in 1867-8 the total expenditure on this account stood at £1,768,744; the total amount of capital guaranteed to railway companies at the close of 1867 was £75,020,436, and during 1868-9 and 1869-70 it is calculated that there will be an increase of £10,000,000. Observations have lately been made in India which would convey the impression that the Indian Government have no control over the expenditure which occurs in this country, and that considerable economy might be effected in it. The fact is that the items of expenditure in this country are very few, and, excepting that of recruiting, they are such that there is very little chance of any diminution being effected on them. There are charges connected with the collection of revenue in India amounting to £275,381, and direct charges on the revenue of India, including the army, debt, superannuations, furlough allowances, &c., amounting to £6,681,806, added to which is the guaranteed interest on railways, £3,494,317, making a total of £10,451,504, independently of certain items which are mere matters of account. The result, then, is that while our revenue is increased by upwards of £15,000,000, our expenditure has increased rather more; so that there is an actual deficit upon the ordinary income and expenses of our Indian Empire for the last year for which we have completed accounts of a little more than £1,000,000. Before passing to 1868-9 and 1869-70, I wish to explain an item which has recently appeared in Indian expenditure, and which is likely to occupy a much more prominent place in future years—I mean extraordinary expenditure for public works. In the last Minute which Lord Dalhousie recorded before he left India, reviewing his own administration, and referring to the frequent deficits in Indian revenue and expenditure, he says—

> "But these apparent deficits are caused by the enormous expenditure which the Government is now annually making upon public works, designed for the general improvement of the Indian Empire. Wherefore a large annua deficit must and will continue to appear unless the Government shall, unhappily, change its present policy, and abandon the duty which I humbly conceive it owes to the territories entrusted to its charge. The ordinary revenues of the Indian Empire are amply sufficient to meet all its ordinary charges; but they are not sufficient to provide for the innumerable and gigantic works which are necessary to its due improvement. It is impracticable to effect, and absurd to attempt, the material improvement of a great empire by an expenditure which shall not exceed the limits of its ordinary annual income."

This, I need hardly observe, points to the absolute necessity of continuing great public works, and of meeting the cost by special loans. Now, in November 1865, in answer to a despatch from the Government of India on this subject, my noble Friend the then Secretary of State (Viscount Halifax), replying to the Government of India with reference to irrigation works, which constantly amounted to much more than £500,000 sterling, gave a qualified assent to the proposal that this expenditure should be met by separate loans, of which a separate account should be kept. During the few months when the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) held the seals of the India Office he replied very much to the same effect, and he approved the principle of providing by special loans for such outlay as roads, barracks, and remunerative public works, but he refused to include in it prisons or gaols. His immediate successor, Sir Stafford Northcote, declined to allow other than remunerative works to be included in such loans; and in July 1868, he sent out a definitive despatch regulating the works in future to be met by special loans, and to be called extraordinary works. His decision was that irrigation and "special fund" works should alone be included under this head. Now, had the decision of the noble Marquess been adhered to, and barracks and great military buildings been included in extraordinary public works, the Indian expenditure and revenue would now have shown no deficit. The deficit has not been above the sum expended on great military buildings. A great scheme for new barracks has cost for the last five or six years more than £1,000,000 annually. I am not questioning the policy of Sir Stafford Northcote's decision, but simply pointing out that it more than accounts for the deficit. Under that decision, which I have not thought it necessary to reverse, we have in 1867-8 a new item for extraordinary public works. In that year irrigation cost only £219,255, and other works at Bombay—special fund works, against which assets were expected to be set off—£382,613, besides £594 on State railways, making a total of £602,462. This increased the deficit in 1867-8 from £1,000,000 to £1,600,000. I now come to the regular Estimate of 1868-9. The accounts are now made up to the end of March, but the regular Estimate is made up when three-quarters of the year have elapsed. We have, therefore, the regular Estimate for the year which ended March, 1869; but we can only guess at the actual result, and circumstances have occurred in India which lead us to believe that there will be some deficit in revenue, and a considerable excess in expenditure. The regular Estimate of revenue for 1868-9 was £49,389,734, which, compared with the previous year, showed an increase of £855,322; while the expenditure was reckoned at £50,464,203—leaving another deficit on ordinary expenditure and income of £1,074,469. Then there are extraordinary works to be met by loans to the extent of £1,838,455; leaving a total deficit on ordinary and extraordinary expenditure of close upon £3,000,000. I am sorry to say that, owing to the very severe drought which has prevailed over a large part of India, there is reason to believe that the revenue is not likely to meet the expectations originally formed of it, and I really believe that but for the energetic efforts of the Government—of which we hear very little because actual famine has not occurred —there would this year have been actual famine over a large part of the North-Western Provinces, Central India, and the Punjaub. This is likely to affect the finances of the country both by deficient land revenue and increased expenditure. I have received an account showing that in the North-Western Provinces the average harvest is 17,000,000 maunds, whereas this year it is expected to be only 7,000,000 maunds, and in the Punjaub 470,000 persons have been receiving direct relief, 89,000 being employed on relief works which are anything but remunerative. I am happy to say that not only has the threatened famine been mitigated by the direct action of the Government, in the form of charity and relief works; but also by a considerable increase in the irrigated districts, showing that the natives are more and more taking advantage of the irrigation canals supplied them in former years, and how advantageous it is that irrigation works should be generally promoted. In the district of Meerut, the increase over the average of the last five harvests amounts to no less than 38,000 acres; and in Moozuffurnuggur there is an increase of 118,500 acres. The Irrigation Report for the North-Western Province says—

> "We find that the land irrigated in 1868 exceeded that irrigated in 1867 by 195,000 acres, made up as follows :—Sugar-cane, 11,000 acres; rice, 12,000 acres; Indian corn, 43,000 acres; cotton, 44,000 acres; and miscellaneous, including all inferior grains, 85,000 acres. The increase of cotton is attributed to the market, and that of Indian corn and inferior grain is regarded as proof that the instructions of Government to push

that cultivation as far as possible have been kept constantly in mind. Good crops have been raised on nearly 500,000 acres; and 2,000,000 acres have been preserved from pressure of famine. The khurreef irrigation is 64 per cent more than that of the previous year."

This is a most satisfactory statement as regards the progress of irrigation in the North-Western Provinces; and I repeat what I have said, that had it not been for the action of the Government and the increase of the irrigated land we should this year have had over a large part of India a famine hardly less severe than that which desolated Orissa a few years ago. I now come to the current year. The estimated revenue is £49,394,000, and the expenditure £49,342,000, showing a small surplus of £52,000. The estimated expenditure for public works extraordinary is £3,565,000, of which £2,705,000 is for works of irrigation, and £360,000 for railways. The only new item in the income of this year to which I shall advert is the conversion of the license tax into an income tax. When I came into Office I found that Sir Stafford Northcote had sent out a despatch to the Government of India pointing out that the certificate or license tax was really nothing but an income tax, and one of a very unjust kind; for while the servants of the Government were assessed as under an income tax, and while the commercial classes were assessed upon their assumed rate of profit, landowners, houseowners, and fundholders escaped; and he expressed an opinion that under a better and more equal system the tax might be made much more productive. One of the first steps I took, after I came into Office, was to inform the Indian Government that Her Majesty's Government entirely approved its conversion into an avowed income tax operative on all classes within the sweep of its operation, and that course was accordingly adopted by my noble Friend (Lord Lawrence) before he left India, and sanctioned by the Legislature. The proceeds are not reckoned very high, because at present the rate is only 1 per cent, but Sir Richard Temple calculated that in the present year it would produce something like £900,000. The result, my Lords, of this statement is simply this — that on our ordinary income and ordinary expenditure—remembering always that we are including Government public works in the ordinary expenditure—there is an average annual deficit of £1,000,000, and that on extraordinary public works to be met avowedly by loans, there is an estimated expenditure of from £2,000,000 to £3,000,000 annually. On the whole, it is impossible to deny that the condition of Indian finances is fairly satisfactory. Considering that the public debt amounts to little more than two years' income of revenue, and that we are able to raise money at 4 per cent, I may fairly say this much. Nevertheless we are not in such a condition as to be careless with regard to expenditure, either ordinary or extraordinary. There has been much dispute among those versed in Indian affairs as to how far those irrigation works called remunerative can, in reality, be found directly remunerative to the State. I cannot doubt that irrigation, if done in a careful and economical way, must, in time, be remunerative to the State; and I believe that this very year — although there are no direct returns from water rates, and although we cannot get at the amount directly due to those works — we have been saved from famine in many districts by the works executed in former years, and saved to a large amount the loss of land revenue which must have naturally followed such a visitation. The last point to which I would direct attention is the construction of railways. I do not know whether the House is aware of the exact footing upon which the Government stands in regard to Indian railways and guaranteed companies. It is commonly supposed that guaranteed railways have been constructed by what is called private enterprize; but I hardly think it can be called so when the money is raised on the credit and authority of the State, under an absolute guarantee of 5 per cent, involving no risk whatever to the shareholders, and sacrificing on the part of the Government every chance of profit, while taking every chance of loss. The system is this —We guarantee the companies 5 per cent upon every shilling of the money which they pay into the Treasury here, that being subject to no deduction except in the case of actual loss upon the working expenses of the line, which has very rarely occurred; and even where it has occurred the Government has flinched from charging it to the guaranteed interest of the company for fear of affecting the credit of railway stock in the market. But that is not all. Not only does the Government guarantee 5 per cent, but it engages that if there be any profit on the working of the line, one-half only of it shall go to the Government, until its own advances have been re-paid, and after that the whole profit and surplus above 5 per cent goes, not to the Government, but to the companies. The Government thus lends money at 1 per cent above that which it could command by direct loans in the market, and if there is any profit the Government gives it to the companies; while any loss is borne by the former. Very soon after I came into Office my attention was directed to this question, and I could not help asking myself why the Government should not have the benefit of its own credit and raise the money directly at 4 per cent. I consulted very competent persons, and among them my right hon. Friend Mr. Childers, who, having lately been chairman of one of those companies, would, I expected, be able at least to see the question from the railway companies' point of view. He, however, was unable to see why the Government should sacrifice its own credit in this way, and bear all the loss while unable to share in any of the profits, and he entirely agreed in the conclusion to which I was inclined to come, that the Government should raise this money directly. I brought the subject before the Members of the Council, and, after prolonged discussion, they agreed that we ought at least to try the experiment of a less extravagant mode of raising the money, and a less extravagant mode of spending it. So far I had come to this conclusion when despatches arrived from my noble Friend (Lord Lawrence) and from the present Governor General upon the question of railway construction, and I was rejoiced to find that they took the same view, urging it with a force which made it irresistible. I now, therefore, lay on the table the reply we have given to those despatches, authorizing the Government of India to undertake the construction of railways by themselves, raising the money upon their own credit, and expending it by their own officers. The guaranteed companies may be regarded from either of two points. They may be regarded as agents for the raising of the money, or as agents for the expenditure of it. Now, as regards the first point, there is no advantage to be gained by the employment of companies — on the contrary, there is a loss incurred, inasmuch as the Government of India could raise the money required directly at least 1 per cent cheaper than it is now raised through these companies. Again — regarding them as agents for the expenditure of the money, it must be remembered that the directors of these companies are gentlemen in London who employ contractors to make these lines or send out engineers to hire the labour necessary for their construction. Now, why cannot the Government take precisely the same course, entering into a contract where it seems advisable, or, under other circumstances, employing labour ourselves? To these questions I apprehend but one answer can be given—namely, that the Government can raise money better and expend it better than the guaranteed companies can. I may give an instance of the excessive inconvenience and cost of the present system. The other day, upon one of the most important lines in India—the Great Indian Peninsula Line—the bridges and other extensive works necessary for carrying the railway through a difficult country came down by the run. These works were found to be of so defective construction that they were wholly insecure, and when the engineers began to mend the bridge they found the structure so rotten that it was necessary to take it down. More than £1,300,000 sterling had been paid for the re-construction of these works, on every shilling of which the Government have had to give a guarantee of 5 per cent. This is a most extravagant system. The railway shareholders have hardly any interest in the working economy of the lines. It is the 5 per cent guarantee which gets the money, and the shareholders calculate very little as to whether twenty years or so hence there may be a surplus above the 5 per cent. With regard to the construction of the lines, I may remark that the companies have their own engineer, and the Government a consulting engineer; the result being that there is a division of responsibility between the two, and there are frequent disputes in consequence. For instance —there is a dispute now going on between the engineer of the Great Indian Peninsula Company and the consulting engineer of the Government as to whose fault it was that such bad works were constructed on the line; and you will, of course, always have such disputes as long as there is divided responsibility. Let the Government undertake the construction of the lines, and you will have single responsibility and single management; and it will be contrary to the nature of things if you do not have a considerable reduction in the cost of Indian railways. When Lord Dalhousie assented to these arrangements he must have had in his mind a state of things very different from that which exists at present. The credit of the Indian Government is much higher now than it was then, and we have been driven step by step into conditions as regards our terms of agreement with these companies which Lord Dalhousie never contemplated, and which, I am sure, he would never have sanctioned. I believe the time has now come—except with regard to the small extensions of existing lines, which probably ought to be given to the existing companies—when the Government of India ought to take into its own hands the construction of new lines at its own cost. I shall not detain the House by any explanation as to the particular selection of lines, which your Lordships will find referred to in the despatches which I now have the honour of laying upon the table. My noble Friend near me (Lord Lawrence) after a careful consideration of the subject, has recommended that various lines of railway, upwards of 9,000 miles in length, should be constructed in our Indian Empire in the course of the next ten or twenty years, and that we should proceed by the direct action of the Government, taking advantage of its own credit and its own agency. One of these lines will connect the port of Bombay with the province of the Punjaub, and it will be of the greatest importance both for developing the great commercial and productive resources of the Punjaub, and with reference to the military defence of our Indian Empire. This is a line which certainly ought to be undertaken by a company or by the Government, and which Her Majesty's Government has itself determined to undertake. There is another most important consideration which is dwelt upon by my noble Friend in the Minute I have laid upon the table; it is that many of those lines will go through important Native States, into which, as a consequence, a very large amount of European labour will be introduced, and it is therefore very inexpedient that those lines should be out of the control of the Indian Government. On all these grounds I trust that the House will give its approval to the course which Her Majesty's Government have taken in regard to this very important question of Indian railways.

The noble Duke then *presented* (by command) a Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India). Also, Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX said, he was sure their Lordships had heard with the greatest pleasure the statement of his noble Friend respecting the state of the finances of India. This was, he believed, the first occasion on which a statement of such a kind had been made in that House. It had always, heretofore, been made in the House of Commons; but as the vote to which they came was merely formal, he saw no good reason why a statement, the sole object of which was to inform the people of this country of the state of our Indian Empire, should not be brought forward in their Lordships' House. He confessed, however, that he was in some respects disappointed with his noble Friend's statement, which, he could not think, showed a satisfactory state of the Indian finances. He attached the greatest importance to the financial status of any country, but more than of any other to that of India, where we could not draw upon the resources of the country for any considerable addition to the taxation, and where therefore it was the more necessary to be watchful as to the expenditure. It might be that he was the more impressed with the necessity of paying attention to economy in India, because he had the superintendence of Indian finance at a time when there was a large annual deficit, but his noble Friend would admit the paramount importance of keeping the ordinary expenditure within the ordinary income. He did not think it necessary to refer to the period before the Mutiny, because since that time a complete revolution in almost every respect had taken place in India. For three or four years the expenditure, in consequence of the Mutiny, caused enormous deficits of £8,000,000, £14,000,000, £10,000,000 and £4,000,000 in successive years. This state of things, however, came to an end in 1860-1, and for the next five years there was either an insignificent deficit, or a fair surplus. In the last of the five years, 1865-6, there was a large surplus, partly owing to the receipts of railroads in previous years not having been brought to account in those years, as it ought properly to thave been; but if the surplus in those five years after deducting the deficiencies was divided equally amongst them it would give an average annual surplus of between £800,000 and £900,000. In the next year, however, matters changed for the worse. In the year 1866-7 there was a deficiency of £2,500,000; in 1867-8 a deficiency of about £1,000,000; and, in 1868-9, an estimated deficiency of £1,000,000, which from recent accounts seemed likely to be swelled to £1,500,000 or £2,000,000. This is independent of any extraordinary expenditure for public works. In three years of profound peace there had been a deficiency of near £5,000,000. The interest of the money borrowed to meet this had, of course, to be added to the expenditure. Beyond this, the balances in the treasuries had been reduced. He could not call this a satisfactory state of things for the past. He came now to the present year, in which his noble Friend anticipated that, without any increase of income, they should be able, by reducing the expenditure to the extent of £1,000,000, to produce a practical equilibrium. He must say that he entertained great doubts as to the practicability of reducing the expenditure in India to such an extent. The revenue of India had steadily increased to a very large extent, but during the same time the expenditure had as steadily increased still more. The additions to the expenditure being higher than that to the income by about £1,000,000, and the tendency to increase was strong and he believed inevitable. His noble Friend had said, and said very truly, that the demands of the local administration constantly required an increase of expenditure. The cost of administering justice in a civilized way was very much greater than that of administering a system of patriarchal justice, under which a man was punished, for example by cutting off his hand, instead of being imprisoned for, perhaps, a couple of years, rendering necessary, of course, the maintenance of expensive gaols. It was the same thing in regard to the police; and, again, the introduction of Europeans into the interior of India rendered it necessary to establish courts up the country capable of trying Europeans. All these things, and many others which he could mention, added very seriously to the expenditure in India. The expense of living had likewise greatly risen, rendering necessary an increase in the rate of wages. In every possible way, in fact, the expense of the civil administration of India went on increasing year by year, and he feared it must continue to do in spite of every effort that might be made to keep it down. [A noble LORD: So much the better.] That might be so in some ways, but the increased expenditure could only be met by increased taxation, and it was not quite certain that this would be so much the better, and satisfactory to the people of India. His noble Friend had referred to the extraordinary increase of the military expenditure. That resulted to a considerable extent from the employment of a large number of European troops; and the greater cost of living rendered necessary increased allowances of various kinds. The pay and allowances to officers which were formerly regarded as liberal, were now barely sufficient to meet their expenses; and, taking all things into consideration, he could not say that he felt very sanguine about a reduction of expenditure, either civil or military, and he was quite sure that it would require the most strenuous efforts both of the Home and of the Indian Governments to effect any material reduction. Neither, on the other hand, did he see the prospect of any great increase of the revenue. The great source of income was the land revenue, which increased but very slowly indeed. In 1865-6 it was £20,343,000; in 1867-8 it fell to £19,900,000; and the regular Estimate for 1868-9 was £20,225,000. Another important item was the revenue from opium, which had yielded about £6,000,000 sterling per annum for the last year or two. The Chinese were, as he had heard, beginning to grow opium for themselves, and they might also derive supplies of that article from Persia and other countries not subject to our rule. These circumstances might seriously affect the demand for Indian opium. A diminution either of the quantity of opium which the Chinese took from India, or of the price for which it was sold, would cause a large reduction of the Indian revenue. It was obvious that this large item of revenue was obtained from a very precarious source, and any great or sudden falling off under this head would place the finances of India in a very awkward position. He now came to the question of the expenditure on reproductive works. His noble Friend had quoted from a Minute by Lord Dalhousie in regard to public works. Now, cotemporaneously with the issuing that Minute, Lord Dalhousie raised a loan of £2,000,000, professedly for public works, but, somehow or other, the money was entirely spent on the ordinary expenditure of India. He did not differ from his noble Friend as to the value of reproductive works, but he thought that much care and caution—which was not often exercised in India—was required in order to insure that the works were so well chosen and so well executed as to afford a reasonable prospect of their proving really reproductive. By a truly reproductive work he did not mean a work that would merely benefit the district in which it was situated, but one that would at least pay the interest upon the money spent on its execution. He confessed to being very sceptical as to the actual money return from what were called reproductive works in India. Many persons doubted the increase of revenue which was said to have arisen in the favourite case of the irrigation of the Delta of the Godavery; and Sir William Denison, the late Governor of Madras, whilst bearing testimony to the improved condition of the people, could not satisfy himself as to the increased revenue of the district. The other favourable case was that of the Jumna Canals. With regard to these canals which we had not constructed, but only cleared out and improved, he believed they now paid a fair interest not on the sum which they cost to construct, but on the sum expended by us in repairing them. It was notorious that the Ganges Canal did not pay, the Baree Dooab Canals did not pay, and the same remark applied to several other cases. The irrigation works executed by a private company in Madras and in Orissa did not pay, and the Government had been compelled to buy them up. He mentioned these facts, in order to show how extremely cautious they ought to be in selecting works which would be reproductive in the sense of being likely to pay within a reasonable time the interest on the money laid out upon them. His noble Friend said he believed that the expenditure on irrigation had prevented famine in certain districts, and therefore prevented a falling off in the land revenue. That was a most beneficial result, but if the only effect of the expenditure of public money in that way was to prevent a falling off in the revenue, whence was to come the money to pay the interest on the outlay on those works? It was obvious that it must be obtained by additional taxation. He believed that whilst works of this character might be undertaken with great advantage, it was necessary to exercise the greatest care in examining the estimates both of the cost of construction and also of the probable returns to be derived from them. With regard to railways in India, when they were originally introduced into that country, it was found that Government guarantee was necessary to enable the companies to raise the requisite capital for their construction. It was at that time deemed a great object—and he thought it was a great object—to promote private enterprize in that country. They had heard much of the mischief of double government in India; but never was there a more complicated system of management than that connected with those guaranteed railways. He was glad, therefore, that the Government had determined to try the experiment of constructing railways by Government officers. He had great confidence in the judgment of his noble Friend (Lord Lawrence) who had recommended this course. With respect to the lines, he quite agreed as to the two lines mentioned by his noble Friend. The line up the Indus would be very advantageous for bringing down the produce of the Punjaub and for sending troops to Upper India from Kurrachee. The line to the Punjaub was indispensable, not only for opening up the country, but for its defence; and in his opinion, as parts of these lines passed through the territories of Native princes, it was quite right that the whole staff which was there employed should be under the complete control of the Government. Before sitting down he would for one moment refer to a point to which he was sorry to advert. He had attempted to induce unguaranteed capital to seek investment in India, and he confessed it went very much against his feelings when he saw that English capital would go into any other country in the world without a guarantee except India, and that there it would not go unless guaranteed. His noble Friend had said very truly that, with respect to India, capitalists had got to be so dependent on the Government that they would not do anything by themselves. He gave them every encouragement, and he was in very great hopes that it would be found worth while for English gentlemen to send capital there without a guarantee, but the result of the experiments of the Light Railway Company had grievously disappointed him. He believed the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) had given a guarantee to that company, but the necessity for doing so had probably been occasioned very much by the pressure on the money market at home. He did not blame anybody in the least for having done so, but all he could say was that it was a great disappointment to him that the attempt which he had made had failed. On reading the speech of Sir Richard Temple he felt greatly gratified to see that the measure for which he had been responsible—namely, the introduction of a paper currency—had succeeded. When that measure was first introduced, the amount of the paper currency was £3,500,000; it had now increased to between £10,000,000 and £11,000,000. He believed that now a paper currency was used in many parts of India, and if measures were taken for the issue, to some extent, of smaller notes than those at present in circulation, it would be a great convenience and a great saving. There was nothing which had effected so great an improvement in India, or which would cause so great a revolution there, as the introduction of railways. He believed that it would go far to break down caste and prejudice, and to carry civilization to the utmost bounds of our Empire. To extend civilization to India was the appointed mission of—what was one of the most marvellous things in the history of the world—our rule in India. That there had been blots and were shortcomings in our administration he could not deny, but he believed that there was no one who knew anything about our administration in India but must be sensible of the blessing it was to that country, and it was his conviction that it would gradually lead to the civilization of one of the most populous and most extensive portions of the globe, and that our Indian Empire would be one of the grandest ornaments of the British Crown.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I wish to join in the congratulations, which have been expressed by the noble Viscount who has just sat down, to the noble Duke for the very able and luminous statement with which he has favoured the House. I am sure it is a great gratification to us that the noble Duke has not thought himself debarred by the fact of his sitting in this House as Secretary of State for India from explaining the great affairs of our Indian Empire, and I think what the noble Duke has done will redound to the advantage, not only of this House, but of the country. I do not know that I have any criticisms to add to those of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax). I agree with the noble Viscount in the view which he has taken of the dangerous nature of Indian finance. It appears to me that Indian financiers are not so cautious or prudish on the subject of deficits as we are in England. Indeed, a French rather than an English feeling on the subject appears to prevail in India. They are content to go on from year to year with a deficit on a very hazardous surplus, and they do not think that the security of their finances is at all compromised by such occurrences. I believe, in the present instance, the difficulty has arisen from the decision of Sir Stafford Northcote with regard to the building of barracks to which the noble Duke has referred. I quite admit it is a wise thing to build barracks, and a virtuous thing to meet the expense of building them out of revenue instead of by loan; but a great deal of the beauty of virtue is taken away when the consequence of doing so is a deficit. I confess it seems to me that it is the duty of those who have the charge of the finances of India to take some energetic steps to bring the present state of things to an end. No doubt we are promised a surplus for the year just come in; but it is only a surplus of £50,000, and in England we should think that a very small one to go on with on ordinary occasions. No doubt we have been satisfied to go on with a much smaller surplus, but it is the rule to secure a much larger. In this country moreover we have no source of revenue at all comparable in its hazardous character to the revenue derived from opium. You may raise new taxes in India if you can; but it is one of the most difficult things in the world. A great part of your revenue is raised from the land, and you cannot increase the charge on it. In England we may go to the Customs; but the moment the Indian financier raises his Customs he has all the Manchester school down on him. I do not blame them; they are right to look after the trade of England. I mention it to show that these financiers of India are in this particular position—that they have not the command of the resources that are usually available to a Government, because they have to consult the private interests of a commercial community in a far distant land. There is little to hope for in the way of increased revenue from excise, because the natives of India do not consume much of what is the subject of excise duties. I fear, under these circumstances, there is but one thing to be done, and that is to press on the noble Duke to go a little slower with the great military expenditure. That is the great sinner. I do not mean the expenditure on the regular army, but on these great barracks. If you insist on spending a large sum every year in building these barracks, and have not taxes to enable you to meet the expense, it is a matter of necessity that a deficit must ensue. There are one or two observations in the speech of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) to which I should like to advert. The noble Viscount seemed to doubt the value of assisting reproductive works, because Government does not get full interest for the money sunk in them. But that is scarcely the correct method of estimating this part of our Indian policy. It should be borne in mind that the State when expending money in reproductive works is not in the position of a man seeking investment for his capital, but rather in the condition of a man who makes a road to his property. When a man makes a road to his estate the tolls may no doubt bear part of the expense, but he looks to be repaid over and over again in the long run by the general prosperity the new facilities for traffic bring to his estate. In like manner railways have been made in England, to the loss of those who made them, but the property through which they have run has greatly increased in value. So the railways in India have not paid, nor can we expect them to pay of themselves at present, but the Government has been no loser by them because they have greatly raised the tax-paying powers of the district through which they pass; and in the case of all reproductive works undertaken in India we may expect that they will raise the tax-paying powers of the natives, and repay the Government in the end. Unless this policy is continued I confess I am unable to see a way out of the dilemmas surrounding us. Another observation I have to make is on the remarks of the noble Viscount with respect to railways being made without State aid. Now, I am perfectly satisfied that if the State wants a railway it must pay for it in one shape or other. The idea that it could ever be otherwise arose out of that gigantic delusion which prevailed in this country some years since—that if you made a railway anywhere, under the sea or across the Sahara, it would be sure to pay somehow or other. The consequence of that delusion was that railways were constructed in this country that were absolutely ruinous to those who originally constructed them; and, as is well known, many small unremunerative lines in country districts have been attached to remunerative trunk lines so that the inhabitants of the large towns are paying, in the shape of increased fares, for the facilities granted to the rural districts. In India it is still more true that except as between two large towns a railway will never pay, and inasmuch as private investors have no interest in improving the population, as compared with the interest of the Government, it is not to be expected private investors will make railways in thinly populated districts at a loss, without a guarantee of present profits from the Government. But it does not follow that it would not be for the interest of the Government to make these lines, for they might be profitable not in the direct return they yielded, but in the effect they had in raising the condition of the people. I quite agree with the noble Duke in the opinion that it is absurd to pay 5 per cent for money when you can raise it at 4; but I do not agree with the opinion, rather implied than expressed, that it has been always absurd to pay 5 per cent.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I did not say that.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Duke disclaims that opinion, and I believe he is right in his disclaimer. There was a time when Government could not have got, I will not say the necessary capital, but the necessary experience, for carrying out railway schemes successfully without the assistance afforded by the original companies. Still it does not follow that what was necessary for the starting of any system in India is necessary for carrying it on. I am very glad to find the noble Duke has been able to overcome difficulties which have hitherto prevented our making railways through Native States. These lines ought to be made as quickly as money can be raised for constructing them. I will conclude, as I began, by thanking the noble Duke for his very interesting statement, and by expressing an opinion that, in spite of some of the fears he expressed and the drawbacks he anticipated, still, on the whole, the finances of India are such as to justify the most sanguine expectations of all those who have looked forward with confidence to the future of India.

LORD LAWRENCE: I do not think I can add anything to what has been said on the finances of India; but I do not like to let the debate close without saying a few words upon the subject. No man who has ever lived in India—certainly no Governor General who has ruled there—has paid a more anxious attention to the finances of the country than I have. Before I went out as Governor General I talked with the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) upon all the salient points connected with Indian finance of which he has spoken, and I believe that upon all important points we were mainly, if not entirely, agreed. [Viscount HALIFAX: Hear!] When I arrived in India my first desire was to reduce expenditure. But on examining into affairs I found that in all expenditure connected with the civil administration of the country it was quite hopeless to think of making any reduction. Not only had prices largely increased, but the allowances of all the subordinate officers of the civil establishments, more especially of all Native officials, was ridiculously and even miserably low. One of the first things we had to do under these circumstances was to increase the emoluments of these officers, and this added considerably to the expenditure of the country. Turning then to the military department, I found we had an army of something like 72,000 English soldiers. During my administration that army was reduced by 7,000, and the Native army was also reduced, though not in the same proportion. But notwithstanding this large reduction the military expenditure in India was somewhat larger when I left India than when I arrived. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) has fully explained the causes of that increase, so that it is unnecessary for me to follow him in this respect. I do not think we could safely reduce the English army below its present strength of about 64,000 men; because we must remember that this 64,000 includes all men in hospital, all the weakly and convalescent, and all the troops passing to and fro between the seaports and the inland stations. Nothing could be more ruinous to our interests in India, more disastrous to our prestige, or more damaging in our finances, than the making of an undue reduction in the English army. I do not mean to say that some slight reduction might not be made, but even on that point there are great doubts; and these doubts increase the more when one inquires into the difficulties which would arise in making these reductions. Some people believe we have too large a Native army, and that a very large saving might be made by reducing the Native strength. I am not a military man, nor do I aspire to be a great authority on military subjects; but no man can live long in India, and pass the greater portion of his time in those parts of India most liable to insurrection, without being convinced that the Native army is not unduly large. It is quite absurd, too, to suppose that the English army of India requires to be as large as it is to keep the Native army in order, and that a reduction of the English army might be safely made if the Native army were first reduced. I am convinced that that is a cardinal error. Anyone acquainted with India, on casting his eye over the map, will see that large portions of the country are populated by races more or less warlike and numerous beyond appreciation. The population of British India alone does not fall short of 200,000,000 of people, exclusive of marauding tribes, which add materially to the ordinary elements of danger. I do not think, therefore, any considerable military reduction is possible; and, on the other hand, I am afraid we cannot look for any large increase of revenue for many years to come—certainly not such an increase as will enable the Government to spend large sums in reproductive works in addition to providing for the ordinary expenditure. The land revenue of India only increases in considerable cycles of years—in several parts of India it is fixed for periods of thirty years—and it is obvious that during those periods no increase can be expected, for all increase which may be looked for is reckoned in the permanent settlement, and in that way £2,000,000 have been anticipated. No increase in the excise revenue can be reasonably expected; and the opium revenue is in its nature uncertain and insecure; and, notwithstanding that of late years it has systematically increased, the present year exhibits a falling off. In my opinion the salt tax, which falls chiefly upon the poor, is too high, and if there were any surplus, it ought to be applied in the reduction of this tax, as far as this can be carried out without loss of revenue. I do not anticipate that the revenues of India will largely increase; but while I do not think we shall be able to reduce the expenditure very much, still we ought to do all that is possible in that direction. One subject in which the people of India take a vital interest is the expenditure of the Indian revenues in England, and there is a feeling in India that the people of that country are not fairly dealt with. Even though it were untrue, the existence of that feeling would be in itself a great evil, and if there be any foundation for that opinion the authorities in England ought to be willing to put things straight. In the case of the Abyssinian War, for instance, all the ordinary expenses of both the Indian and the English troops serving beyond the seas in Abyssinia were charged against the Government of India on the pretext that to have done otherwise would have been to save so much money to the revenues of India. I think that was a fallacious view of the question, and I hold that we should have dealt with India on that occasion exactly in the same way that England deals with India as regards English troops. The moment English soldiers leave England for Indian purposes the expenses are borne by the Indian revenues; but the moment the troops pass beyond the frontiers of India all the expense, whether ordinary or extraordinary, is made to fall on the English revenues. That is a fair and just rule, and it should be uniformly applied;—there ought not to be two rules, one applicable to troops leaving England for India, and another applicable to troops leaving India for Imperial purposes. With regard to public works, I consider that expenditure for works of a reproductory character ought to be raised by loan, and should not be charged to ordinary expenditure. Hitherto there has been a great conflict of opinion in India on this point, and many influential people have argued that not only should we charge reproductive works, but also extraordinary works, such as barracks, upon the revenue of India. I believe the late Secretary of State for India, put the thing on the right and true basis—namely, that where it is reasonably to be expected that there will be a moderate return for the expenditure it is right and proper the money should be raised by loan; and, on the other hand, that works, however important, which did not produce a direct return should, as far as possible, be charged to the ordinary revenue of India. With great deference to the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) it would never do to reduce the speed with which the barracks are being erected. On the grounds of humanity and policy, and even of finance, it is much better that they should be constructed at the quickest rate consistent with economy. The English army in India has increased with enormous rapidity since the Mutiny; barracks of an inferior description have been run up; and in the course of years these have become much deteriorated. The re-construction of them was one of the matters pressed upon me, and one of the first I took in hand; and I was zealously supported by the Commanders-in-Chief. But I greatly fear that, with all the pressure that can be put on, the re-construction of the barracks will take ten or twelve years. This is a matter of the utmost consequence. The barrack accommodation affects the sickness and mortality of the troops, and their efficiency in the event of emergency. Some four or five years ago a statement was circulated in the English papers to the effect that the mortality among English troops in India was 70 per 1,000; I believe that estimate to be excessive, but still the mortality is very large, and a very considerable proportion of that mortality is due to insufficient barrack accommodation. The result of the construction of new barracks and of the making of various changes has been that we have reduced the mortality very largely, and I am very sanguine that, with the completion of the barracks and the adoption of better sanitary arrangements, the mortality of the British troops in India will not very much exceed that of our troops in the colonies. I do not take a gloomy view of the finances of India, but I do think every fair means of adding to her income ought to be tried, avoiding such as will be oppressive and unpopular to the people of the country. What is remarkable is that a number of people cry out for expenditure without thinking where the money is to come from; but if the tax touches them in the slightest degree then there is a strong clamour for examination and revision. Untunately, the period for which the income tax was imposed was allowed to expire. A year had scarcely elapsed before it was found necessary to impose an income tax of 1 per cent; but that will not give us the revenue sacrificed, and at the same time it is insufficient to keep things straight and in order in case of any great emergency or unlooked-for misfortune. There is great importance in times of peace not only in trying to make both ends meet, but to have such a margin as will admit of a reduction in taxation. I am fully impressed with the enormous advantages which India will gain by carrying out a large system of irrigation. Irrigation is to the greater part of India what drainage is to agriculture in this country; and I am convinced that if proper places are selected, and the works are judiciously carried out we shall not only re-pay ourselves the whole of the money incurred in making canal irrigation, but we shall largely add to the revenue of the country. No doubt some of the most important of the public works in India have not paid in a financial point of view; but it must be remembered that the science of the construction of canals was not well understood by the engineers in India. But I am perfectly certain that, in course of years, you can get not only a fair revenue from these canals, but that you will be able to set aside sufficient to re-pay the original capital. The statement made by the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) with reference to the canals of the River Jumna was scarcely correct. It is quite true that these canals did exist under the Native rule, but to a very poor extent. But scientifically I believe it was an error in constructing the canals to take the lines which had been used for the old canals. Nevertheless, these canals during the last thirty years have not only repaid the whole of the capital expended, but have also given an annual return of 5 per cent upon the capital during the whole of that period. I think, therefore, that I am warranted in saying that that is a good financial result. As to the question of railways, I think credit should be given to those who commenced the present system. It is only right we should recollect that but for the old companies we should not have had these works in India—certainly not so early as we did. In those days there was a great difficulty in embarking in large works of that kind, and had it not been for the energy and spirit with which the original companies took up the subject the railways would never have been in existence. We have now some 4,000 miles and upwards of railways in India, and in the course of next year the original scheme which embraced the whole Continent of British India will be completed. Probably the railways constructed in India will not cost less than £18,000 per mile. But I am convinced, not only from my own observation but from consultation with every class of people in India, English or Native, that the present railway expenditure in India is enormous, excessive, and unreasonable, and that if we took the works into our own hands we could carry them out at a very considerable reduction. Now, when we consider that at the very least we want 10,000, 20,000 or 30,000 miles of railways more than we now have in India, it is easy to conceive what an enormous sum would be saved if, instead of paying £18,000 per mile, the railways cost only £12,000 per mile. If that result could be effected, instead of the guarantee system which now entails so serious a burden on India, we should not only repay ourselves the interest on the money we have had to borrow, but we should have a margin whereby to repay the capital invested. For these reasons, my Lords, I trust that the authorities in India will take works of this nature more immediately under their supervision.

LORD LYVEDEN: I think, my Lords, that the public is very much indebted to any Minister who awakens its attention to subjects so important as the finance of India. I quite agree with the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax), moreover, that the manner in which the noble Duke has treated this subject is very satisfactory, whatever the prospects may be. I wish, however, he had gone a little more into detail. He entered very explicitly into what has occurred in the past, but, declining to be prophetic, he gave us very little information as to what the intentions of the Government were as to the future. Now, my Lords, it is evident that there are only two ways in which these deficiencies can be remedied in the future—either by diminution in the expenditure or by an increased revenue. The first mode of diminishing the expenditure that has been referred to is the reduction of the military expenditure; but no one, I trust, will propose at present to relieve India from any of that expenditure by the diminution of the European forces. It is plain that, after the experience of the Indian Mutiny, it would be almost madness to withdraw, at this moment, any of the European forces from that country. I believe, too, that a reduction in the barrack expenditure would be a great evil. Such a reduction would almost inevitably be attended by an increase of disease among the troops; and, therefore, on the point of economy as well as of humanity, it is advisable that the expenditure in barrack accommodation for the troops should be kept up. If the expenditure be not absolutely necessary at all times, it would, at all events, be wrong at the present time to make any reduction in that direction. Now, my Lords, in old times, we were told that the revenue of India was not elastic; but we now find, I am glad to say, that it does to some extent possess that quality. My hon. Friend Sir Richard Temple has, I am glad to see, had the courage to propose the re-imposition of the income tax. I believe that there never was a greater mistake than that committed by Sir Charles Trevelyan in withdrawing that tax after it had once been imposed. But I am willing to confess that I should be sorry to see that tax increased, and that the tax is one which, in my opinion, should, as a rule, be kept for the difficulties of war. Among the topics upon which my noble Friend the noble Duke in his statement did not enlarge is the question of cotton. That subject is one of great importance. It would, of course, be hard upon India to force the cultivation of cotton upon its inhabitants, but I do think that the Indian Government are bound to provide roads and machinery for the transport of the cotton to the seaports. Ought the question of cotton to stand in this position, that when the American market is closed, as it was during the American war, a stimulus is to be given to the cultivation of cotton in India, but when that source of obtaining cotton is re-opened no further demand will arise from Manchester? The subject is one to which the attention of the Government ought to be directed. Then comes the question of the gold currency, which is also of great importance. I think that the adoption of a gold currency is very advisable. The noble Lord (Lord Lawrence) knows the importance of this, and with his force of mind I wonder that he did not carry it into effect while he was in India. Sir Richard Temple has gone very elaborately into several matters which he thinks of moment in the present financial state of India. I venture to think that my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) may with much advantage direct his attention to the Uncovenanted Service. My noble Friend stated what he would do in respect of railways; but I suppose he did not allude to lines in respect of which there is already a guarantee; I suppose he referred to railways which may be promoted in future—because I never could understand why the Government should have guaranteed 5 per cent on railways, inasmuch as the natural effect is to make parties invest in railways so guaranteed rather than in

Government securities, which would pay them only 4 per cent. The complaint I make of my noble Friend's statement is that it does not go far enough. He has not gone into the state of India generally. He has not gone into such political details as might have enabled your Lordships to form an opinion as to whether there is a reasonable certainty of continued peace, or whether there is any reason to apprehend war. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs need not be afraid that I am about to indulge in any observations on the Central Asia question. That is not what I mean; but I think my noble Friend the noble Duke might have given us some information as to our relations with the Native States, and as to the communications recently had with Native Rulers, more particularly with Shere Ali. My noble Friend has perhaps thought he ought to confine himself to such a statement as that suggested some time ago by my noble Friend (the Duke of Somerset), to which I presume we are indebted for the speech made this evening by my noble Friend the Secretary for India. My noble Friend may, perhaps, intend that a more general statement shall be made to the House of Commons by the Under Secretary. Nothing can be more hopeful than the language used by Sir Richard Temple in his splendid peroration. I trust that his anticipations may be realized; but the speech delivered by my noble Friend this evening does not enable me to see exactly what are the grounds for these anticipations. With regard to the question of public works, I must say that I do not think there ought to be any diminution in them. I cannot agree with my noble Friend the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) that there has been exaggeration in reference to the remunerative works. I think that such works ought to be paid for out of a special fund, and that ordinary works ought to be paid for out of the ordinary revenue. I have no doubt, however, that all these matters will have the careful consideration of my noble Friend at the head of the India Office.

Earl FORTESCUE hoped that the noble Duke would give every attention to the improvement of the sanitary condition of the barracks in India. By doing so he would promote efficiency, economy, and the interests of humanity. It would have been impossible to allow the barracks to remain in the disgraceful and murderous state they had been in some time ago; but he hoped the noble Duke would go further, and with all reasonable speed take measures for further improving the barrack accommodation for the soldiers.

The Duke of ARGYLL, in reply, said, that in a communication which he had received from Lord Mayo, his Lordship attached much importance to the fact that the equilibrium of Indian finance was about to be restored. The surplus would be only a small one, but there would be a surplus. Their Lordships must be aware that there were peculiar elements of uncertainty in all Indian budgets. First, there was the danger of droughts; next, the danger of a deficit in the revenue from opium; and, thirdly, the possibility of frontier wars. Some of those wars had cost, not only hundreds of thousands, but millions of money. So far, however, as regarded the Estimate of the present year, there appeared to be, not a deficit, but a surplus. With regard to the growth of cotton, one of the projected lines of railway would open up an important cotton growing district. He had been strongly urged by a deputation from Manchester to assist an undertaking which was expected to be of much value to our commercial interests, and he had sent out an engineer to report on it, who was now on his way home. He was sure that the Government in India would give their best attention to the cotton question.

Then the Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India) *ordered* to be *printed* (No. 219); Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9 *ordered* to lie on the Table.

EXTRADITION TREATY WITH FRANCE.

QUESTION.

Lord CHELMSFORD: My Lords, I rise to put a Question to the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. In 1843 an extradition treaty was entered into between this country and France, and, in the same year, an Act of Parliament was passed giving effect to that treaty. The offences named in the treaty were not numerous. They consisted of murder, attempt to murder, forgery, and fraudulent bankruptcy. The treaty was in existence from 1843 till 1865; but, so far as any action on our side was concerned, it remained a dead letter during the whole of that period, because not a single criminal was delivered up by us to France. That arose from the view the chief police magistrate took as to the course which he ought to pursue when persons were brought before him for extradition under the treaty. He thought it his bounden duty not to give up an accused person unless he were satisfied on the evidence before him that there would be a conviction if that person were put upon his trial. I think that view of the matter was hardly in accordance with the terms of the treaty. I believe that what was intended by the treaty was this—that an accused person should be given up supposing the evidence brought before the magistrate were such that, if the offence were committed in this country, the accused would be committed for trial. There was also a misapprehension as to the effect of a judgment *par contumace;* the chief magistrate being of opinion that such a judgment put a person out of the category of an accused person. Therefore, when it was found that a person had been condemned *par contumace* in his absence, the chief magistrate said—"This is a convicted and not an accused person, and, therefore, I must discharge him." Now the magistrate was entirely in error with regard to the French law in this respect, because, in point of fact, a person who has been convicted *par contumace* is, on being apprehended or delivered up, tried in exactly the same way as any other accused person, the previous judgment *par contumace* having no effect whatever upon the proceedings. Then the French Government had another ground of dissatisfaction, in regard to the proof required of the documents which were transmitted from France. The depositions which were certified by the *Juge d' instruction*, and authenticated by the signature and official seal of the Minister of Justice, were not admitted as evidence in this country, unless the person producing it proved that it was a true copy of the original depositions. These various sources of dissatisfaction induced the Government of France to give notice, in 1865, that, under the terms of the treaty, they would put an end to it within six months. The noble Earl, who was then, as he is now, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (the Earl of Clarendon), sent Sir Thomas Henry, the chief magistrate at Bow Street, over to France to negotiate on the subject with the French Government. I must admit that the noble Earl could not have selected a person better fitted to conduct the negotiations. The noble Earl stated, on a former occasion, that it was mainly owing to his ability and to the zeal with which he conducted the negotiations that we were extricated from a position of some embarrassment. On Sir Thomas Henry's return the noble Earl had a Bill prepared, which would have removed many of the causes of dissatisfaction, and which applied generally to the proof required in all cases under the extradition treaties. I am much surprised that there should have been the least disposition in any quarter to prevent that Bill passing into law. Soon afterwards, however, the then Government went out of Office, and Lord Derby's Administration was formed. The Bill framed by the noble Earl (the Earl of Clarendon) was then found at the Foreign Office, and I, having at that time the honour to hold the Great Seal, was charged with the introduction into your Lordships' House of that measure, which I entirely approved. That measure of course received the cordial support of the noble Earl, and the simple object of it was to enact that when the documents and depositions transmitted from France in reference to the extradition of offenders were certified by the Judge or the magistrate to be true copies, and when that fact was further authenticated by signature and seal of the department of the Minister of Justice, they should be taken without further proof to be evidence in all our courts of justice. Of course, the Bill was easily passed through this House with the concurrence of the noble Earl, and was sent down to the House of Commons, where, to my infinite surprise, great jealousy existed in certain quarters as to the objects which the French Government had in view in desiring the continuance of a treaty; because they thought the design of the French Government was to lay hold of political offenders, under the pretence of preferring some criminal charge against them. There was not, however, the slightest ground for any such imputation. It is expressly laid down in the law, as to extradition, of France, and it is made a point of honour, never to deliver up or to demand any political offender, and if a person who is a political offender is given up under an extradition treaty for another offence, he is, if acquitted, or in the event of his conviction after the expiration of his sentence, warned that he must leave the country within a certain period, and it is only when he neglects to do so that he can be apprehended and tried for the political offence. So strict, indeed, were the French on this point, that when a person had committed several criminal offences, and was delivered up under an extradition treaty for one of them, he could not be tried for the other offences without a fresh application being made for the extradition of the offender. The feeling, however, which prevailed in the House of Commons induced them to determine that the Bill should not be in force for a longer period than twelve months. Accordingly the Bill passed, its duration being limited to that term. In 1867, it was found necessary to continue that Bill for another year; and, in 1868, the same course was pursued; but, on each occasion, it was necessary for the Government to apply to the French Government to continue the treaty, and I must say that the French Government, though somewhat dissatisfied, had acted with the greatest courtesy and forbearance, and yielded to the application. In 1868, a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the whole law and practice of extradition. I should, however, state that the French Government were so desirous of removing any jealousy which might exist with regard to their supposed anxiety to get hold of political offenders, that they expressed their willingness to have a clause introduced into the Bill to the effect that the magistrate in this country should himself decide whether the offence with which a person might be charged was of a political character, and if he came to the conclusion that it was, he might at once discharge the accused. Well, the Select Committee, to which I just referred, drew up a Report, on which was founded a Bill. That Bill, which is now, in all probability, in the Foreign Office, was prepared in 1868. We have now nearly arrived at the end of the Session of 1869, but still that Bill has not been introduced into Parliament. There is undoubtedly a very strong feeling in France of annoyance and dissatisfaction at the delay which has occurred; and a Minister has said publicly that it seemed rather surprising that the Government of England had taken three years to decide whether they would agree to an extradition treaty precisely similar to the fifty-six treaties which France has entered into with other countries. In conclusion, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it was his intention to bring in a Bill this Session to enable Her Majesty to conclude an extradition treaty with the Emperor of the French?

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: I understand perfectly the feeling which has induced my noble and learned Friend to bring forward this subject, and I am much obliged to him for having dealt with it in so conciliatory a manner. It is not my intention, nor have I, indeed, the power, to bring forward a Bill of Extradition this year. The noble and learned Lord has, I think, himself indicated the extreme difficulties which stand in the way of dealing with this question. As he remarked, there was considerable opposition to the very simple Bill which was brought forward by himself, so great was the jealousy and fear entertained by the House of Commons lest political offenders should be delivered up. I think, however, it is of very great importance that we should have an extradition treaty, not only with France, but also with other countries; for it is a great disgrace — particularly now that the means of intercommunication between different countries have been so much improved—that this kingdom should be a harbour and asylum for all the rogues in the world. The Bill which had been prepared laid down the principles on which extradition treaties were to be concluded not with France only, but with all the countries of Europe. The Foreign Office and the Home Office have been in communication on the subject, and the Bill has been ready for upwards of two months; but it has fallen, like many others, a victim to the exigencies of measures of greater magnitude and importance—as, for example, the Irish Church Bill and the Bankruptcy Bill, by which so much of the time of the Session has been occupied. It was really found impossible to bring it forward; and I am quite sure that the noble and learned Lord, with his great Parliamentary experience, must feel that it would be extremely inconvenient to introduce Bills of this character, on which great difference of opinion exists, and protracted discussions are likely to arise, unless there is a reasonable prospect of passing them. As far, however, as the Foreign Office is concerned, I engage that this shall be one of the first Bills which shall be brought in by that Department next year. I hope that no injury will result from the delay thus occasioned, because we have already received the assent of the French Government to a satisfactory arrangement on this matter.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Contagious Diseases Act (1866)—Was *presented* by The Lord NORTHBROOK; read 1ª. (No. 221.)

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 23rd July, 1869.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Committee. [No. 352.]

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Public Works (Ireland) * [202].

Committee—Report—Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * [217]; Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment * [214]; Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * [53].

Report—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) * [181-238].

Considered as amended—Valuation of Property (Metropolis) * [100]; Railways Abandonment * [219]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * [191].

Third Reading—Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) * [216]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment * [182], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

REGISTRATION, &c. OF NEWSPAPERS.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that the authorities of the British Museum have issued a Circular requiring proprietors of Provincial Newspapers to deliver regularly to a Mr. Lethbridge, on behalf of the British Museum, and for the use of that Institution, a gratuitous copy of each and every newspaper they publish, with the postage paid thereon, while up to this time these newspapers have been delivered to the local stamp distributors and paid for by them; and, whether this requisition is not contrary to the requirements of "The Copyright Act, 1845?"

MR. BAINES said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that since the passing of the "Newspapers Repeal Act, 1869," the proprietors of newspapers are subjected to inconvenience and expense owing to the appropriation of the titles of their newspapers by other persons, and the registry of such titles at Stationers' Hall under the Act 5 and 6 Vic. c. 45; whether he will endeavour to prevent this piracy of title by the transfer to Stationers' Hall of the existing register at Somerset House, or otherwise; and, whether he will also provide the public with the same facilities for inspecting the register as were formerly afforded at Somerset House, as the officer at Stationers' Hall declines to allow the inspection—gratuitous or otherwise—even of the index of such register of newspapers there kept, unless applicants can furnish him with the title of the particular newspaper for which they wish to search?

MR. AYRTON, in reply, said, as this was a question involving matters of considerable importance to the public Press, he might be permitted to give a somewhat full answer to these inquiries. Up to the commencement of the present Session the periodical Press was subjected to two separate systems of law—one imposed for the purpose of collecting taxation upon the Press, and for the purpose of repressing supposed abuses in the publication of libels. That branch of law, with one or two exceptions, had been entirely repealed; but proprietors of newspapers were still at liberty to have stamps impressed upon their newspapers, if they so desired, in order to circulate them through the Post Office. The other branch of law affecting the Press was that with regard to copyright. The Copyright Act had not been in any way affected by the change that had been made this Session, and newspapers were still entitled to all the privileges which the Copyright Act gave them. That Act required as a condition of such privileges that any persons publishing any printed matter should deliver a copy to the British Museum, and up to the present time the authorities of the British Museum had been in the habit of making use of the Inland Revenue Department for the purpose of receiving the newspapers they desired to preserve in its library. In consequence of the repeal of the law, however, the British Museum was now thrown back upon its more appropriate rights under the Copyright Act, and it was, therefore, to that Act that the newspaper Press and the British Museum must look respecting their relations with one another. In consequence, therefore, of what had been done in the present Session, the British Museum had issued a Circular to the Press calling their attention to the Copyright Act and the necessity of delivering copies of their publications to the British Museum, They were required at their own cost to take care that the British Museum should receive copies of every number of a newspaper. In order to facilitate this transmission, the British Museum had employed a gentleman who was constantly in communication with the periodical Press in the office of Messrs. Smith, but if any gentleman chose he might send his newspaper direct to the British Museum. So far as the British Museum was concerned, it was a convenience to them that the newspapers should not be sent by post on each day of issue, and the transmission would be more economical in parcels at intervals of three or more months, provided that full and complete files of the paper were furnish from time to time. Under the Copyright Act, undoubtedly, everyone was entitled to search for any newspaper that might be entered, and if the persons at Stationers' Hall did not give facilities for such a search for the fee of 1*s*. they were in fault. An entry of a newspaper once for all entitled it to the privileges conferred by the Act, and if any other person made a false entry the Copyright Act contained strong provisions applicable to such a case.

THE POLICE AND THE PUBLIC.

QUESTION.

MR. LOCKE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been directed to a recent charge against three young men at Marlborough Street Police Court, and to the published comments of Mr. Knox, the magistrate, upon the conduct and evidence of the police, and, whether he intends to direct any proceedings to be taken in the matter?

MR. BRUCE: Sir, the facts of this case have received my very careful consideration. It appears that on the night of the 1st of July there was a disturbance in the Haymarket, between the hours of one and two o'clock, a large number of prostitutes being present. Certain persons were arrested on the charge of having taken part in the disturbance and of having assaulted the police. The magistrate before whom the case was brought dismissed the charge, believing the statements of the persons accused rather than the sworn evidence of the police. The constables were men of good character and of long service, and were especially selected for the very arduous task of keeping order in the Haymarket at night. Undoubtedly the decision of the magistrate throws doubt upon their veracity and trustworthiness. The rule established by the Home Office, after much experience in such matters for the guidance of the Chief Commissioner of Police, has been that, in all charges against members of the force where the evidence is conflicting, and is supported on either side by witnesses who are not members of the force, the case should be left to the decision of a magistrate. The Chief Commissioner of Police has no means of conducting a judicial inquiry, without which no decision affecting the character and interests of the members of the force could be properly made. The proper course, therefore, in the present case would seem to be, that the gentlemen aggrieved should either summon the policemen for assault before a magistrate, or should proceed against them by way of indictment. Should the result of either of these proceedings be unfavourable to the policemen, it would be the duty of the Chief Commissioner to inflict such punishment, by dismissal or otherwise, as might seem adequate to the offence.

MR. LOCKE: I should like to ask, Sir, if the right hon. Gentleman intends to recommend that the Government should indict the policemen, or whether it is to be left to the persons who have been injured?

tial portion of our proposal, or desired to treat it as a subject of conflict. It was quite enough for us to ask, and all we could ask, that Parliament should make a solemn legislative declaration of the general purpose to which the money should be applied, and should reserve to itself all other discretion. Of course even that discretion is likewise reserved. We, who are modifying the Act of Union, could not and should not wish to set up any higher claim for ourselves than we allow to others; but we did think it a great and important object that this large sum of money should not be suspended as it were before the eyes of every party, of every section of a party, of every local community, of every candidate at an election, to become the subject of promises, bargains, and intrigues, which would tend to corrupt both the representative and the constituencies. We have been censured, and perhaps not unnaturally—for I will admit that the case is open to observation both ways—for the introduction of some minute and careful specifications into the clause which are said to be open to objection; but I ask those disposed to criticize us—what would have happened, how should we have fared, and, what is more important, how would the Bill and the public interest associated with the Bill have fared, if we had introduced the Bill in the condition, as regards the surplus, in which it came down to this House from the House of Lords? I do not think any man would deny that in that case we should have laid ourselves open to the gravest charges, and interposed the gravest obstacles in the way of the passing of the measure. I would call on the man who thinks that we could have presented a Bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, which would have wholly and absolutely relegated to the future the question of the application of the surplus, to recollect the history of the Reform Bill of 1866, and what happened when the proposal was made to separate the questions of enfranchisement and disfranchisement. Sir, this is not, so far as I am concerned, intended to be more than an explanatory and apologetic plea. Not one word have I said, nor will I say, conveying the slightest reproach to any one. My task is one far more agreeable. I am sure it must be the desire of all who hear me, now that we have arrived at this solemn point in the history of the nation, that every man should discharge from his recollection whatever words may have tended, be it much or little, needlessly to embitter this great controversy. And, Sir, to support by practice that which by precept I have suggested, I call to my own mind that I used an expression in the discussions of last week that gave offence "elsewhere," when I described, perhaps, by an ungainly figure, not, as those who recollect my words will know, any general unacquaintance on the part of the Lords on the subject of public affairs, but their necessary comparative unacquaintance with the details of the engagements and obligations between Members of Parliament and their constituents; but the expression has given offence, and I therefore regret that I used it. Sir, I have now gone through the Amendments, excepting, advisedly, the main one, which I am desirous of placing in that position of prominence that in every way belongs to it. The main Amendment is the Amendment in the commutation clause. We have agreed to accept as our own, to make part of our policy, and earnestly to recommend to this House, with whatever urgency we may presume to use, the adoption of provisions which will materially alter the operation of the commutation clause. The changes to which I need refer, I think, are only two. One of them is that the proportion of clergy in any diocese who are to agree to commute before certain effects can follow is to be altered from four-fifths to three-fourths. We do not see the advantage of that arrangement, but we can understand the motive by which it has been dictated; and this is palpable, as we think, that it in no way adds to the burden likely to be imposed on the funds by the alterations in the commutation clause. We therefore have adopted it because it was desired. But the main alteration is this — that subject to the same condition of working by a large majority within the limits of each diocese, and, of course, with the perfectly equal application of the principle to the Presbyterian Church in its various and separate divisions, the sum of 5 per cent shall be added to the sum of 7 per cent which was the increment of commutation which the House sanctioned when the Bill was last before it. The pecuniary effect of this change it is not easy to compute with precision. I think its operation will probably be somewhat reduced by the change from four-fifths to three-fourths; but if it is largely acted upon, it will lead to an additional charge upon the fund for the disestablished Church to an extent somewhat exceeding £250,000, and there will be a corresponding sum, though my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derry (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) may not admit that it will be a corresponding sum, but there will be a corresponding percentage laid on the fund for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church. Now, Sir, this is the important change, as far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, to which we have assented. And I ought, in recommending such a change to the House on the part of my Colleagues and myself, to acquaint the House with the grounds on which we recommend it, and the manner in which we have arrived at it. Sir, from the first moment of the conception and of the introduction of this Bill, our dominant idea, to which every other has given way, has been the sense of our duty of keeping strict and loyal faith with the people who have sent us here. The engagements at the last General Election were no ordinary engagements. In general, a candidate goes before a constituency with general declarations of opinion, which are liable necessarily to very large varieties of application. It rarely happens that an issue perfectly distinct on a question of primary national importance is submitted to the country at a General Election. Such an issue was submitted at the beginning of 1784, when Parliament was dissolved upon the question between supporting George III. and the Ministry of Mr. Pitt against the coalition of Mr. Fox and Lord North. Such an issue was submitted when, in the spring of 1831, the country was asked whether it would rally round and sustain the Reform Bill of the Government of Lord Grey. Such an issue was again submitted in the November of last year, and these three occasions of questions so put with such distinctness, and upon interests so vast, before the country, are the only three, so far as I know, that the Parliamentary history of an entire century affords. Sir, we had no choice—whether as persons engaged together in government, or as persons actuated by a sentiment of individual honour—we had no choice, except to make strict fidelity to our engagements, the cardinal consideration to govern our course. Subject to that, we were desirous to make every concession to the Irish Church about to be disestablished that was compatible with the principles of religious equality which we desired to run like a silver cord through the whole tissue of the Bill. That being so, when the Bill came back from the House of Lords to be discussed in this House, we carefully reviewed and severely tested the provision we had made, and asked ourselves what were the points on which it would be possible for the House of Commons, without derogation from the principle of the Bill, to make further concessions either to the Church or to any other religious body. The result of the conclusion at which we arrived was exhibited in the Amendments which we recommended, and which the House was pleased to adopt in the debates of Thursday and Friday last; and the pecuniary effect of those Amendments, so far as we could judge, was to grant to the disestablished Church a sum of money little short of £800,000, besides the sum corresponding in respect to the commutation which was granted to the Presbyterians. These were our overtures towards the settlement of the question, and I refer to them now because they form an essential link in the chain of the transactions. Other overtures were made to us; and after we had concluded the process in this House we again considered what our course was to be in the event of such overtures being made, and whether it was still possible for us to make any step in advance. We still concluded that we had done all that the principle of the Bill, strictly considered, would admit—nay, that in respect of private endowments we had done more than the principle of the Bill, strictly considered, would admit. But, notwithstanding, we at once arrived at this conclusion, that considering all the great interests involved in the case, the benefits of passing the measure, the mischief of its rejection, the value of peace, the desire we entertained for it, and lastly the deference which none of us should be ashamed to own that he owes to the other branch of the Legislature—the combined force of these considerations, we at once concluded, would lead us, provided the question ever reached that issue, to recommend strongly to the House to make some one further sensible and substantial concession in order to bring about an agreement with the House of Lords. Now, Sir, that is a plain, unvarnished tale; and it is upon that tale that we wish our case to stand. I have no doubt that considerable collateral benefits will arise from accelerating commutation by increased inducements, for every commutation where the clergyman is a landlord, puts an end to his position as a landlord; and that, in Ireland, we think to be no small or secondary benefit. But still the main grounds on which we recommend the concession —as it is certainly in our view a concession beyond the principle of the Bill —are those I have briefly detailed— they are the immense public interests involved, the great objects we have in view, and the desire to defer to and concur with the House of Lords in the exemplification of that harmony of our institutions which, perhaps, has rarely been more severely tried than during the discussions of the present year; and which, I thank God, has stood the trial. Sir, I know not that I need add anything in explanation of these Amendments, excepting to say that, immediately that we found that a disposition existed which gave us hope of a common basis, my noble Friend, Earl Granville, in that spirit which all would desire, and with that capacity which I think all admit, entered into the detailed communications which have resulted in the settlement which we now recommend. And, Sir, it is but fair that I should repeat, what I have before gladly said, that I owe my acknowledgments to the Opposition in this House for the manner in which— abstaining from every effort to clog the course of this Bill, whether by open or by secret obstruction—they allowed the issue to be taken fairly, and while fighting the battle with the courage that becomes them as English Gentlemen they stooped to no unfair advantage. And further, Sir, I must refer to "another place," and must acknowledge with satisfaction and thankfulness, not only the ability which I grant to be a great ornament and glory of the other House as displayed in debate, but that comprehensive sagacity and forethought, that power of realizing the future and of preparing for it, which alone, I think, has brought about on the part of the House of Lords the recommendation of the settlement which I am now authorized to urge upon this House. Sir, we have arrived indeed at a great period. When this Bill receives—as I trust it will receive within a very few days—the Assent of the Crown, every man must be conscious that a change has begun to pass over the moral atmosphere of Ireland. I think, too, that, quite apart from the differing views which we have taken of this measure, every man will feel that, at the introduction of this new period, it is a solemn duty for each of us, in his sphere, to labour to accomplish his own prophecies, if they have been sanguine, and to defeat his own predictions, if they have been gloomy and unfavourable. And, moreover, I am confident that this will be the spirit in which this measure will be ushered into the world. So far as we are concerned we have urged it as a remedy, in part, for the diseases of Ireland, because we are convinced that in equality, as it is understood in this country—and it is here a term of far different import from that which the corresponding phrase bears across the Straits of Dover—that in equal laws and equal rights there is a potency of charm for healing political and social wounds, and for creating that concord which is the strength and glory of a nation. On such grounds it is our duty to test to the utmost the power of that principle, and as a portion of that process it is that we have urged this Bill. But, Sir, in endeavouring to put an end to a state of privilege for the minority, it is not, I hope, to introduce a state of tyranny on the part of the majority. I trust that the majority will disclaim that tyranny both in word and action, and indeed if they should not we should be compelled to admit that although it might exhibit a condition of things less odious than that which we have put down, yet it would still be a condition of odious and intolerable wrong. To the Roman Catholics by this Bill we offer nothing but that which we believe to be their strictest due. With the Presbyterian community we have endeavoured to deal on principles of equal justice. To the Church that is now disestablished, and towards which not one of us can ever feel a sentiment other than that of earnest good-will—to the Church now about to be disestablished we simply record our wish and prayer that there may be developed in her, according to her means, those masculine qualities by which a great crisis can be met. And we bid her God-speed on her new career. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving that the Lords' Amendments be now considered and agreed to.

MR. VANCE, who rose amid cries of "Agreed," said, that, as the representative of a cathedral city (Armagh), he had a right to deliver his sentiments upon this subject. He looked upon these Amendments less as a compromise than as an unconditional surrender. In the question of the commutation, a noble Lord in the Upper House proposed that the commutation should take place at fourteen years' purchase, which was strictly analogous to what had been allowed in the case of Maynooth. But the right hon. Gentleman only offered a bonus of 7 per cent, which, in fact, only represented the greater longevity of the clergy; and the addition of 5 per cent would not prove of much real benefit to them. Indeed, he doubted if the clergy would commute at all under such disadvantageous circumstances. He regretted that the Lords did not adhere to their views respecting the ecclesiastical residences and the preservation of the glebes. In many of the poor and remote districts the means for purchasing those residences would not be found, especially if the landlord were an absentee; and in that case the gift of the churches would be useless, and the purpose of giving them would be altogether defeated. But he further objected to yielding on this point, because those residences had been promised by Cabinet Ministers whom he now saw before him, and who had pledged themselves on their canvass that the glebes should be restored to the Church. He did not blame the noble and learned Lord who conducted these negotiations (Lord Cairns) so much as he did those noble Lords who deserted him at the last moment on the subject of the Ulster glebes. Those glebes ought never to have been given up. They never were the property of the Roman Catholics; they were the gift of a monarch on conditions that had been strictly fulfilled; they had been restored from the wilderness, drained and fenced by their owners; and he was sure that the people of Ulster would look with indignation at the confiscation of these lands. It had been carried out against every principle of right and equity; and it was an act of the English Parliament which would neither be forgotten or forgiven. Then there was no provision made for the maintenance of the cathedrals. It would be impossible for the disestablished Church to maintain them, especially in the remote districts; she would have enough to do to maintain the churches, and the cathedrals would gradually sink into ruin. Then he thought the House of Lords ought to have maintained the surplus intact, as the minority in this House wished it to be; and it ought to be remembered that the minority was greater on that point than any other. He would remind the House that at the very moment when the House of Lords was engaged in making these concessions the Solicitor General was charging them with being ignorant of the feelings and regardless of the wishes of the people of England. He thought their Lordships had carried concessions much too far, and the consequence of the compromise come to last night would be that the Church of Scotland would be next attacked. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had put himself into the hands of the voluntaries and Dissenters, and they had aided him in this work of the demolition of the Irish Church, because they knew that it would give them a power which would before long be used against the Church of England. Indeed, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a voluntary church in one part of the Kingdom, and an Established Church in the other—at all events, it would be a subject of constant agitation. He believed the Lords would live long enough to repent of the act they had now committed.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER: I do not think it would become those who, to the best of their power, have maintained the opinions of the minority during this long, anxious, and arduous discussion, now that they think the course taken is, under all the circumstances, wise, and right, and creditable to all concerned—I say I do not think it would become them to be silent, and not to accept the responsibility of declaring that opinion upon the present occasion. In all human affairs there is a point at which persons must accept an adverse decision, and bow to the superior force and power of those with whom the practical control of affairs remains; and it is not the course of true wisdom when that point has been reached, to refuse to see and to acknowledge it, or, without a hope of improving the position of any class, to maintain a struggle against public opinion, simply for the sake of that conflict and that struggle. If here or "elsewhere" it had appeared to any who had the responsibility of judgment that, by keeping this question open and deferring a settlement, better results for the country—or, speaking on the part of those who had the interests of the Church at heart, better results for the Church—would have been likely to be obtained, that belief would have justified a corresponding course of action. But, for my part, I cannot conceive that anything would have justified a deliberate choice of policy which would have kept this question, having attained to its present position, longer open and unsettled, to be a constant source of irritation and mutual recrimination and excitement, inflaming the passions and feelings of large classes of men both in England and Ireland. Nothing could possibly have justified that but a strong and, I venture to say, a reasonable opinion, that by so doing some good practical result was likely to be attained. I, therefore, cannot blame as if it were an ignominious surrender—I rather applaud the wisdom and generosity of those who, having done all that they could, felt that the limit had been attained, and that by persisting in a fruitless opposition they should be doing harm and not good to the very interests they desired to protect. And I must say it appears to me that on the side of the Government there has been substantial concession, both of feeling and of something of real practical value, to the disestablished Church. Of feeling, because all men have their feelings, and when a Minister is in the position of my right hon. Friend, supported by so great and so loyal a majority, sure to be able in this House to carry by a great majority anything on which he thinks fit to insist, and having no reason to doubt that he would be supported out-of-doors in any course that he might adopt—when such a Minister, conducting a measure like this, has taken a strong, strict, and severe line, and has from time to time spoken as if any deviation from that line on the side of greater liberality towards the disestablished Church might be, perhaps, a deviation from the principle of the Bill, it did require some courage in himself, and some confidence in the generosity and wisdom of this House, before such a Minister could make up his mind, under the influence of those considerations—which my right hon. Friend has so worthily spoken of to-day—to make the concessions for the sake of peace which he has announced to the House. And I venture to say that the motives for making those concessions which my right hon. Friend has mentioned are such as increase their value, such as are honourable to himself, and, I may add, are motives the absence of which from the mind of anyone occupying so high a position I should have thought matter to be deplored almost more than any calamity which could happen to the country. If there be any duty of a Minister so powerful as my right hon. Friend—I venture to say none can stand higher than this—to contribute what is in his power to the maintenance of the authority of all the branches of the Government, and of the Constitution under which we live, and do his best to avoid conflicts and irritation between the two branches of the Legislature, and to bring into harmony all the parts of our system of government. To that responsibility and to that duty my right hon. Friend has shown himself not insensible. He has been met in a corresponding spirit by what appears to me to be the unanimous sense of this House. And I must add that the disestablished Church could not certainly have had a worse fate before it than to become disestablished, not now, but some years hence, perhaps, after a prolonged period of conflict, and after other great interests in the country had been endangered unnecessarily for her sake. In the interest of the disestablished Church it is better that she should go forth into the world with something less than than what her advocates consider justice, than that she should get more as the price of such perils and dangers as otherwise might have been incurred by those other great interests. I cannot conclude without saying one word to express my personal feeling as to the way in which my right hon. Friend has conducted this measure—in a way in which all of us must, I think, appreciate. He has referred to an unguarded expression which was used by him upon one important occasion, not with the intent of conveying any species of disrespect to another Assembly, but which, having been so taken and so understood, he has, in disavowing the construction put upon that expression, retracted it with the best possible grace. I feel bound to say, as far as I myself am concerned, not only that from the very beginning I have been certain that my right hon. Friend, in the course which he has taken in this matter, has been actuated by the purest motives, but that it seems to me that, from the beginning to the end of the discussion, he has conducted it with temper, moderation, and dignity, with courtesy towards his opponents, and respect towards this House.

SIR FREDERICK W. HEYGATE said, that, the supreme moment of the political death of the Irish Church having arrived, he was anxious it should die with dignity. The principles which the Church held were true, and it would take far more than any measure that had ever passed the Legislature to do them harm. He deeply regretted the injustice and injury which had been done to the Church; and he was more satisfied than ever of the impolicy of the arrangement which had been made. But he rejoiced with the hon. and learned Gentleman who had spoken last, that if the passing of the Bill were inevitable, and if they were simply to retain through its rejection a respite of a few months, or possibly of a year, the period of suspense had been put an end to. Nothing had been more painful to him, and he was sure to most if not all of those who sat behind him, than to have mixed up with what to them was a great religious question subjects of a pecuniary and humiliating character. But, situated as they were, it would have been wrong in them had they neglected to support, as far as lay in their power, the just claims of all persons concerned to liberal compensation. It had been freely asserted that the Church, though disestablished and disendowed, would still carry off a very substantial portion of its endowments. He entirely denied that assertion, and he could not comprehend the arguments by which it was supported; and he must say that if there were any one thing more unfavourable to the future of the disestablished Church than another it was to carry off the semblance of endowment without the reality. He ventured to offer his thanks, and those of Members sitting around him, to the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Roundell Palmer) for the sincere and valuable assistance which, all through these debates, he had given to the friends of the Church; on all occasions, perhaps, they had not been able to agree, but they felt that the support given them in his advocacy was that of a just and powerful friend. The fact should also be recalled to mind that all through these debates not one word had been uttered in any way reflecting on the character or energies of the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland; that would be a pleasing memory which would remain with those who had advocated the cause of the Church. And, looking back on the brilliant display of eloquence which had been made in "another place," perhaps the most ornate and effective speaker of all who had addressed the House of Lords was one who, though his title was Bishop of Peterborough, owed his origin to the soil of Ireland, and his training to the Irish Church. While he regretted the change, he would say, speaking for the great body of the Irish Churchmen, that into the future, however black or dark for themselves, they would not carry any resentment towards those individuals of differing faiths in Ireland who would be the gainers by the change. He could hardly bring himself to believe that it would do so, but he hoped that out of the present trial and depression might grow the materials of a better understanding among all classes in Ireland, conducing to the peace and prosperity of the country.

MR. WHALLEY said, he rose to express a hope that the assurance given by the First Minister of the Crown that the Bill would be a means of conciliating differences and restoring peace and harmony in Ireland would be verified. On former occasions similar assurances had been given by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but time after time those assurances had not been fulfilled, and further concessions had been called for. He trusted that those who presided over the Church of Rome would not now violate the pledges which had been given on their behalf by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government; and that they would stand them in better stead than the obligations on which they relied in vain during the last sixty or seventy years.

Sir JOHN ESMONDE said, he hoped it might not be considered unbecoming in him, as some Irish Catholic of more importance had not risen, to tender to Her Majesty's Government his sincere and hearty thanks for the result at which they had arrived upon that day. Indeed, he thought that the thanks of the country were due to both sides of the House for the manner in which they had borne themselves during the long and exciting struggle which was now about to close. The Government generally, but especially the Prime Minister, deserved the highest praise for the earnestness and intelligence which they had manifested from first to last in grappling with this momentous question. He did not think it would be becoming if they were to separate without bearing testimony to the great services of his right hon. Friend the Attorney General for Ireland. Throughout the whole of that trying time he did not think any hon. Member could recall one instance in which his right hon. Friend was not to be found at his post; ready against all comers, with untiring energy and thorough acquaintance with the subject, from the great principle of the Bill down to its minutest detail. He could assure his right hon. Friend that he had watched him with pride since the time they were at College together grasping one after another the honours of his profession until he had capped them all by the honour of that day. He wished to be allowed to include his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland in his tribute. He felt rejoiced in being one of that band of Irish Members who had been lately described by his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade as having supported Her Majesty's Government all through "almost unanimously and with great fidelity," although, in so doing, they only obeyed the wishes of the country. He reciprocated words of conciliation spoken at the other side of the House by the hon. Baronet the Member for Londonderry, and he trusted this might be the beginning of an era when Irishmen would be drawn closer together. The First Minister of the Crown might well feel proud of the great occasion for which they were assembled that day. Looking back along the line of history an event stood out to his view which he thought bore some analogy to his position. When Columbus returned to Spain after the discovery of America, by the favour of his Sovereign and amidst the acclaim of the nation it was granted to him to bear upon his escutcheon the proud legend, "For Castile and Leon Columbus found a new World." The policy which the right hon. Gentleman had inaugurated towards Ireland would, he believed, yet entitle him to a greater fame than that of having, by just legislation, changed an integral part of this United Kingdom from a weakness and a danger into a glory and a strength.

Mr. LEFROY said, he had honestly and sincerely opposed the Bill in its progress through the House, and deeply regretted that it had ever been introduced. He should not, however, hesitate to admit that he had listened to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government that day with pleasure, seeing the tone and spirit in which it was couched. He trusted that the silver cord which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of as running through the Bill would extend to the working of the measure, and that those happy results would flow from its operation which he (Mr. Lefroy) had not been sanguine enough to expect. So far, at all events, as he personally was concerned he should do everything in his power to make it work for the benefit of his country.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he wished, in the name of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to tender his thanks to the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, and not only to them but to that rank and file of Members for England, Scotland, and Wales who supported him and his co-religionists in the endeavour to secure an act of justice for their country. Though the day might be called one of triumph he desired to say that Irish Roman Catholic Members did not desire to treat it in any manner as a triumph over their Protestant fellow-countrymen. In the great struggle which had taken place their only idea had been to break down the barrier which had so long separated different classes in Ireland. He hoped the time was now nearly approaching when Irish struggles would no longer be of a religious character. Religious dissensions were responsible for creating a strange set of circumstances in Ireland; but he hoped they would all be wiped away by the passing of the present measure. The time might come when great political changes might occur in Ireland. As a Catholic he might become Conservative, although he did not think that was likely to be the case; and, on the other hand, perhaps some of the friends of the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Frederick Heygate) in Derry might be inclined to relinquish some of their long-cherished Conservative opinions. He had risen in no feeling of triumph, but simply to express the joy he felt that the great difficulty which had so long kept Protestants and Catholics disunited in Ireland had been removed. For that great event they had to thank the right hon. Gentleman who presided over Her Majesty's Government.

MR. CHARLEY said, he had to thank the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government for the uniform courtesy which he had extended to him personally in the course of these debates, and he must bear testimony to the admirable good taste which had characterized the remarks which the right hon. Gentleman had just addressed to the House. If he (Mr. Charley) had on any occasion used strong language, it had been under circumstances of great provocation; and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would believe him when he said that there were Protestants in Ireland who had gone so far as to request him to impeach the right hon. Gentleman at the Bar of the House of Lords. For the admirable good taste which the right hon. Gentleman had displayed on this occasion, and the lenient way in which he had used his oratorical dictatorship, he begged to thank him. At the same time, he deeply regretted that the House of Lords had read the Bill a second time, and that they had assented to the present compromise. If the House of Lords had thrown themselves unreservedly on the Conservative democracy of the country, they would have been supported in throwing out the Bill. He had hoped that they would at least have adhered to their Amendments, and, on the Prime Minister refusing to accept them, have given the country another opportunity of considering the question. He believed that if Parliament had been prorogued, and the Bill had been sent to the Lords a second time they would have thrown it out on the second reading. As a representative of the Conservative democracy, which was totally opposed to the Bill, he felt *functus officio*, and would gladly resign his seat, did he not feel that so long as the oratorical dictatorship of the right hon. Gentleman continued, no part of our Constitution was safe. It was the Church of Ireland that was attacked to-day. It might be the Church of England to-morrow. And he regretted that the most reverend Prelates who presided over the Church of England had, by abstaining from voting against the second reading of the Bill, admitted the most pernicious principle that the State could seize upon and secularize property which had been solemnly dedicated to the service of Almighty God. Against that principle he entered his emphatic protest, and if it should be applied to his Dissenting friends opposite no doubt they would be happy that he should retain his seat to assist them in combating it. What had the House done by means of the present Bill? Disunited two Churches which had taken sweet counsel together for centuries. The homes of the clergy, their glebes, and their tithe rent-charges they had devoted to secular purposes, and had told Protestant Christianity in Ireland to go forth bare and naked, as if Ireland were still the Pagan country that she was when Patrick first set foot on her benighted shores! The time would come when the Presbyterians of Scotland and the Dissenters of England would regret the union which they had effected with the Church of Rome in order to strike down a Church which was apostolic in her discipline, and which, although episcopal, was the least prelatic and the most evangelical Church in the world.

MR. KIRK said, he had been returned to that House to support the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, and to effect, as far as possible, the equality of all religious sects in that country. He objected to the present settlement, therefore, inasmuch as it did not secure that equality; for while the disestablished Church was to have £250 to £300 a year for each of her clergy, the clergymen of the Presbyterian Church would receive not more than from £36 to £39 a year. He felt, therefore, that his pledge to his constituents was not fully redeemed by the Bill, but at the same time he did not wish to disturb the unanimity which seemed to prevail in all parts of the House on the present occasion.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I think it quite unnecessary, and certainly inconvenient, that, on an occasion like the present, we should enter into any discussion of the principle of this Bill. My opinions on the subject remain the same, but it does not appear to me that this is an occasion that requires an expression of opinion from any hon. Member on that important point. If there was a difference between the two Houses as to the principle of the measure, I could easily understand, though the consequences might be of a grave character, that a delay in the settlement or further consideration of this question might have been advisable, and not only expedient, but, upon the whole, wise and politic. But, when the difference between the two Houses has resolved itself into what we all must acknowledge to be matters of detail, I must say that I have always felt that delay in the settlement of this question, while bringing with it very doubtful advantages, might lead to difficulty and disaster to no inconsiderable extent. We should therefore remember that we are called on to consider to-day, when differences between the two branches of the Legislature have taken place on this question of the Irish Church, whether it is possible to come to an agreement with respect to details, and not in the least with respect to any principle involved in the Bill. Both the House of Lords and the House of Commons have accepted that principle. Now, I hear some talk of unconditional surrender, instead of amicable compromise in this instance; but I cannot help thinking that those who use expressions of that kind must really associate the acceptance of these Amendments with the acceptance of the principle of the Bill. I can easily understand that if an hon. Member is of opinion that by dissenting in some very small points of detail the defeat of the measure might be secured, he should wish that course to be taken; but it can be owing only to a confusion of ideas of that character that the phrase "unconditional surrender" can be applied to the settlement which is proposed for our consideration to-day. Let us see whether this is a just view of the case. The points of difference between the two Houses are really reduced in number to four. Considerable modifications have been agreed to by the Government in three of these — modifications, indeed, in a very important proposal, which amount, I might say, almost to a total change of its character. If that be the case; if, when there are only four points of difference between the Houses, points of detail, Her Majesty's Government has consented to a scheme which in three of these points introduces considerable modifications—I cannot understand how any hon. Gentleman can be justified in describing an arrangement of that kind on our part as one of unconditional surrender. It appears to me, on the whole, to be a wise and conciliatory settlement of the points of disagreement, and, although I do not wish to introduce my own opinion upon the subject—for it is not necessary —if I had really to decide which party had the best of the arrangement, I should think it, for the purposes of debate, more prudent to hold my tongue. Very likely the same feeling may influence Gentlemen on either side, and if, therefore, there is a reciprocal feeling of that nature respecting the settlement, I think we may arrive at this conclusion—that the compromise is a fair and just one. If the differences between the two Houses involved, as I ventured to observe before, the principle of the measure, I could understand hon. Gentlemen expressing, in terms of becoming indignation, their opinion of what they considered an unconditional surrender. But, even from their own point of view, it could only be an unconditional surrender of points of detail, not of any principle of policy, and when you come to examine into the terms of arrangement, you find at least, to use the mildest phrase, that as many of these points of controversy are conceded to us as have been conceded by us to the Government. If any arrangement was to take place upon this matter I cannot understand how it could have been brought about in any other way. I know there are some who very much regret that the point as to the glebe houses has not been insisted on. But allow me to say that that has been considered by some of the best judges at all times a questionable demand,

and that, if conceded, it might involve conditions as regards the future right of the State to interfere with the general property of the disendowed Church, which might be inconvenient and, perhaps, even dangerous hereafter. There is no doubt whatever that the strong feeling that exists upon the subject of the glebe houses and the necessity of that concession being made to the disendowed Church of Ireland, arose from certain expressions of the right hon. Gentleman and some of his Colleagues upon that subject during their canvass last year. They have frankly admitted that those views were then held by them and those expressions used, and I have no wish whatever to enlarge upon the subject further than to repeat what on another occasion I did mention, merely because it is a political truth which ought not to be forgotten — that I trust this will be the last occasion on which political questions will be dealt with on abstract principles. If the right hon. Gentleman had not laid down so broadly and abstractedly the principles on which he would settle this business he would have been able to have settled it more easily and in a manner which would have conciliated the feeling of powerful classes now much —I will not say outraged, but certainly much pained and offended, and we might have brought about this settlement in a way that would have been infinitely more satisfactory and more advantageous to the country. It must be remembered that there is not a single principle that was laid down on which this legislation was to take place from which, in practice, the right hon. Gentleman has not been obliged to deviate. It is not merely in certain cases where, contrary to his principles, he has been obliged to do something for the disendowed Church. Take, for example, the case of vested interests. Every vested interest and every personal position was to be respected in this settlement. But what was the first thing you did? You were obliged to attack some of the most important vested interests, and deprive individuals of some of their highest offices, such, for instance, as the ecclesiastical baronies. I do not say you were not justified in doing it. I do not say it would have been a wise thing to leave the Bishops of the disestablished Church in the House of Lords, but their expulsion from that House was a complete violation of the principle of respecting all vested interests and personal rights. It shows you, therefore, that you could not adhere strictly to your abstract propositions; and that being so, I wish the right hon. Gentleman had deviated from them a little more, and had been a little more liberal to the clergy and laity of the disestablished Church of Ireland. He would have made a more satisfactory settlement if he had not been hampered by the enunciation of abstract principles by which, practically, he has not been able to abide. I only wish to impress upon the House that we really were on the eve of circumstances in our political life which we ought most to dread and avoid—namely, collision and misunderstanding between the two branches of the Legislature, and that at a moment when both Houses had so comported themselves that they really deserved and possessed the respect and confidence of the country. We have assembled here to-day to sanction and ratify upon matters of detail the settlement proposed by the Government, which will terminate the chances of such a collision not by sacrificing any principle, not by giving up any great doctrines in politics which we have supported under difficult circumstances in the face of the majority that has asserted them, but by assisting in a conciliatory and, I hope, satisfactory adjustment of points of detail which, on the whole, have, I think, been arranged with due consideration to the claims of both parties. Let us view what we are doing in that light. Do not let us consider what we are sanctioning this morning under the perverted and erroneous supposition that we are settling and deciding great principles of policy, and particularly the principles upon which this measure is founded. That is finished. The House of Commons has agreed to disestablish and disendow the Church of Ireland. I regret it. The House of Lords has agreed to it, and by no mean majority, and the affair is at an end. But when hon. Gentlemen regard what after all should be looked upon by both sides of the House, under the circumstances, as a statesmanlike and satisfactory settlement of a most difficult question from an erroneous and perverted point of view — namely, that we are now settling the principles of the measure, whereas we are only arranging in an amicable and conciliatory manner for all parties certain details of the measure — they may believe with my hon. Friend (Mr. Vance) that there has been an unconditional surrender of principle, although there has only been, I repeat, a satisfactory and statesmanlike settlement of detail.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that upon any other occasion but the present he should have felt it necessary to dissent from some of the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) as to departures by the Government from principles which they had laid down on this question. He might also have protested against the tone of some part of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman, in which he appeared to undervalue the enormous importance and gravity of the questions of which the House was now disposing. Upon this happy occasion, however, he had no wish to enter into matters of controversy. He hoped he should not be violating the rule he had laid down for himself, if he asked his hon. Friend the Member for Newry (Mr. Kirk) to re-consider the remarks he had made, and he thought it would become clear to him that the Presbyterians of Ireland had been treated in a spirit of the utmost impartiality. There was no point affecting them which had not been anxiously considered by the Government and settled upon terms at least equal to those given to the Established Church. As to the statement that the compensations given to the Presbyterians were far inferior to those of the Established Church, it was not inequality in the true sense of the word, but it was an inequality arising out of the inevitable circumstances of the case, for compensation must bear a strict and equitable relation to the endowment of which it was to take the place. He knew the candid mind of his hon. Friend, and hoped he would explain to his co-religionists the principles on which this Bill was founded. And now a word upon the termination of this great and memorable contest. No one sitting on that Bench could possibly have taken a deeper interest in the measure which had now reached its final stage in this House, and of which, for many years, he had been an advocate. Now, he agreed in what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite—that this was not a case of unconditional surrender, and that a settlement had been arrived at, creditable to both sides, and to the other House of Parliament; and it was a triumph, not of abstract principles, but of the great policy which the Government and the Liberal party had been pursuing. He held this to be a great satisfaction. He regarded the spirit both of the majority and the minority, with the best hope for the future, when he recollected the tone of the speeches which had been delivered, and he would particularly refer to the speech of the hon. Member for Dublin University (Mr. Lefroy). He looked upon the measure which was now brought to a successful issue, as one of the greatest acts of justice and wisdom ever adopted by any legislative assembly in the world, and he trusted that an era of constantly increasing peace, prosperity, and concord in Ireland might date from the period of this great historic event.

Mr. MACFIE said, he thought the country had much cause to be satisfied with the issue of this great conflict; and he could tell the Members of the Free Irish Church, from the experience of Scotland, that she had nothing to fear, and might throw herself boldly and with reliance on the Christian sympathies and support of those who belonged to her communion.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, he had no desire to prolong the discussion, but he was unwilling to remain silent after having heard the observations of his hon. Friend the Member for Newry (Mr. Kirk) in disparagement of the great measure now about to be completed. He would, therefore, however unwillingly, ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes in order emphatically to express his dissent from those observations. He would remind his hon. Friend, who so efficiently represented Presbyterian interests in that House, that while the Presbyterian community, who number about 600,000, obtained something, and that a very considerable something, under the Bill, the 5,000,000 of Irish Catholics, to whom originally belonged all the Church property now being dealt with, got absolutely nothing. He would ask the House to mark the difference—the Presbyterians complained because having got much they did not get more, while the 5,000,000 of Catholics, who asked nothing for themselves and who got nothing, were content because they saw in the great act of the hour a recognition by both Houses of Parliament that they were entitled to stand on the same platform of equality as their Protestant fellow-countrymen. He (Sir John Gray) regretted that even one Irish Liberal Member expressed dissatisfaction at the results attained. He rejoiced, however, that the dissent did not come from a Catholic representative, for he believed the whole Catholic party were content with the signal advance made. ["No!"] He heard one voice say "No;" but he would ask who ventured, when the demand for religious equality was made in 1866, to hope that in 1869 that demand would be conceded with the concurrent assent of both Houses of Parliament? He (Sir John Gray) could at least speak with authority, and, more important still, with authority based on recent communications, for the great Catholic community he had the honour to represent; and with that absolute and recent authority he would say that his constituents in Kilkenny, most of whom were Catholics, would accept the great act of justice with gratitude and with entire contentment; while for himself he would say—and possibly it would be conceded that he had some right to offer an opinion in the matter—that it far exceeded the most sanguine hopes entertained three years ago as to what might be obtained in the direction of religious equality within so brief a period. The right hon. Gentleman who led the Opposition, with that personal caution and political prudence which he invariably displayed in all cases of party difficulty, stated, when addressing the House, that he would abstain from expressing any opinion on the question as to which party had the best of it in the adjustment arrived at. He (Sir John Gray), standing in a sense apart from both parties, would not hesitate to express his opinion, though he might have to use somewhat of a paradox, and say that both parties had the best of it. He never looked upon and never treated this question as a mere party question. He looked upon the act now about to be completed as a great act of national justice about to be accomplished by the public assent of all parties for the benefit of the Irish nation, and from this great national measure of right and justice all parties in the State and all sections of the community would reap signal advantages. Men interested in party may dispute as to who has the best of it. It ought to be their duty to see the great good that will come to all parties from establishing in Ireland content and confidence in the wisdom of Parliament. He would say of the House of Lords that the course adopted by them at that critical moment was most creditable and generous, and from it they would reach the rich reward of securing the confidence of the Irish people by demonstrating that the Lords as well as the Commons of this great Empire are willing on cause shown—on a fair case being clearly and conclusively made out—to lay aside the cherished prejudices of centuries—bow to the public opinion of the nation, and by a great act of retributive justice redress at any personal sacrifice the grievances and remove the wrongs of the Irish people. The Lords and Commons then had both "the best of it," for from that day forth the Irish people would judge of the Imperial Parliament by the great act of conciliation now being adopted by all, and would feel that one by one all the wrongs they complain of will in a similar spirit of justice be removed, when calmly and fairly brought under discussion. The Bill now about to become law would heal the wounds of centuries; and he felt bound to add that the tone of the last debate in the House of Lords—the kindly and generous tone and the conciliatory words used in that House that day, but more especially the language of conciliation and forbearance in which the Irish Conservative representatives accepted this great revolution, would sink deep into the Irish heart, and he hoped be imitated by all public men in Ireland so as to prepare the way for future co-operation in securing peace, prosperity, and unity amongst all classes of his countrymen.

MR. MIALL: Sir, I cannot part with this subject without one word of farewell. I will not, however, detain the House for long, for after all that has passed my emotions are too deep to admit of my addressing the House at any length. But this is a question on the settlement of which I really think it becomes some representative of the Nonconformist Body to say one word. I cannot but rejoice that one great and important principle of the Nonconformist Body has now received legislative adoption. I believe it to be a principle of justice, and I think that in regard to Ireland the consequences of its adoption will soon appear, in greater harmony, greater social confidence among the people, and truer and more earnest exertions for the promotion of their religious ends. I trust, Sir, that the religion to be henceforth propagated in Ireland will be far less political and polemical in its character than it hitherto has been; and I wish to say, so far as I can say it on behalf of the body whose sentiments I represent on this occasion, that now that the Church of Ireland ceases to be a political body, we shall on our part be ready to afford her any assistance that we can in promoting her views and in placing her in a strong position. There never has been any feeling in our minds which would tend to the destruction of that body as a spiritual institution. We never have wished it to occupy a position of disadvantage. We do not believe that the money which has been left with it now will be of essential service to it in the future, but that the only way in which that Church can triumph over the difficulties of her position will be by putting forward the true spirit of self-sacrifice which our common Christianity demands from all Churches. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on having conducted this great controversy to a successful issue, and I trust that the end of it will be the initiation of a new era of peace, harmony, and prosperity for Ireland.

MR. SERJEANT DOWSE said, he had taken a great interest in this great question, never having been absent from a single division having reference to it. As an Ulster man he wished to say that he believed the glorious settlement which had been arrived at would be satisfactory to all the Irish people. During his canvass of the city of Londonderry, the Roman Catholic electors never asked for anything more than perfect religious equality; the name of Maynooth was never mentioned, and he was convinced that they would have abandoned all claim on account of Maynooth rather than forego that glorious settlement. He believed the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland would also approve of that measure. It might appear to them at first sight that there was some inequality in the mode of dealing with them and the members of the Established Church; but it should be remembered that the principle of the Bill was compensation, and the amount of the compensation must, of course, depend upon the nature and value of the life interests. He thanked the Government and both Houses of Parliament for having brought to a final issue that great question by a settlement which, in his judgment, was thoroughly and entirely satisfactory.

Amendments and Reasons read a second time.

Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon its disagreement to the Amendments insisted upon by the Lords; and doth agree to the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, and to the consequential Amendment to the said Bill.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—ARREST OF MR. MURPHY.—RESOLUTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE: * I owe, Mr. Speaker, the position which the Notice standing in my name occupies to the arrangements of Her Majesty's Government, because I had attached that Notice to Class III. of the Civil Service Estimates—the class in which the expenditure connected with the administration of the law in this country is proposed to be voted, and the arrangement of the business of this House connected with Supply rests with the Government. Considering the nature of this Motion, I cannot help thinking that it is somewhat appropriate that the subject of my Notice should occupy the attention of the House immediately after the House has come to an agreement with the House of Lords upon the Irish Church Bill, for the substance of my Motion portends the future of Ireland. A great measure has just passed both Houses, by which there will hereafter be no Established Protestant Church in Ireland. The Motion which I have now the honour of submitting to the House is intended for the defence of freedom of speech, particularly in the enunciation of religious opinion.

I may remind the House that there is no Established Church in the United States of America. The position of the United States is in this respect, therefore, analogous to that which will be the position of Ireland. It is known, Sir, that up to the period of the late civil war in the United States there was a system of persecution—too often with the sanction of the official authority—directed against those who ventured publicly to express Protestant opinions. It was inevitable, from the nature of their religion, that these men should also be the defenders and promoters of freedom. Many of these persons were persecuted, some of them were murdered, and John Brown was executed. At whose instance were these persecutions carried on? I have ample details here, with which I shall not, however, trouble the House, but which show that it was invariably at the instance of the Roman Catholic clergy, that these persecutions were carried out by Irish Roman Catholic mobs, at the instance of the Roman Catholic clergy, with the late Archbishop Hughes at their head. I am fully alive, Sir, to the difficulty of the task I undertake, but I believe, in proposing this Motion, that I have the same right of reply as you sanctioned lately in the case of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie), when he brought before this House a Motion with respect to some abuses which he conceived to have taken place in the Coventry Election. The Motion which I now propose impugns the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department in relation to the directions which he has issued through the Law Officers of the Crown or with their advice, for the exercise of certain powers which, by Act of Parliament, comes within the province of his Office. Mine, Sir, is no light undertaking, and considering that I have been a justice of the peace for nearly thirty years in the county of Middlesex, and the City of Westminster, it is a task which I would not lightly undertake. I have lately presented a Petition to this House from a meeting that was held in St. James's Hall. At that meeting I presided, at the request of the secretaries and other persons connected with various Protestant bodies existing in this metropolis. I was present during the whole of the proceedings, but I did not attach my signature to the Petition as chairman, because that would not have been conformable with the usages of this House. Their meeting was attended by never less than 1,000 persons; when the meeting was fullest, about 1,300 or 1,400 were present. There is a very singular circumstance connected with that meeting. No full or fair account of it has appeared in any of the daily papers. I saw the reporters before me. I saw them taking notes; but in *The Times* there did not appear one word with reference to this meeting, whilst the notice in the *Standard* contained little more than a list of the principal persons present. It really seems to me to be rather extraordinary that a meeting such as this should have been ignored by the public press to the extent that it was. Hon. Member are aware, however, that a full report of the proceedings at this meeting has been published, and I believe it has been placed in their hands. That publication arose from the circumstance that I would not consent to preside at a meeting for such an object without having a competent reporter present, in order that I might be able to testify to this House that nothing occurred at this meeting of which I, as chairman, might have any reason to be ashamed. I now proceed to the subject-matter of that meeting. It has been stated that the meeting was called for one purpose, and one purpose only—namely, to defend or promote the interests of Mr. Murphy, the Protestant lecturer. Sir, if that had been the object of the meeting I should not have taken the chair, and my hon. Friend the Member for East Lancashire (Mr. Holt), and my hon. Friend the Member for the West Riding of Yorkshire (Mr. Joshua Fielden) would certainly not have attended; for we are not prepared to accept the title of "Murphyites" in any sense whatever. But, Sir, it is always necessary, in order to illustrate the infraction of a principle, that some individual case of grievance should be brought forward, and it must be clear to every hon. Member, who bears in mind what has occurred with respect to this person Murphy in this House, that his case could not be ignored by anyone who believes that the right of free discussion has been violated in his person. I know very well the danger of alluding to individuals. Three or four years ago I brought under the notice of the House a Motion with respect to the conventual and monastic establishments of this country, and moved for a Committee to inquire whether there was not occasion for some inspection of these institutions. It happened that in the Session preceding I had made a Motion in a matter connected with the death, the disposition of the property, and the circumstances attendant on the burial of a Mr. Hutchinson, of whose property the late Father Faber, the head of the Oratorians, became possessed. This person, Mr. Hutchinson, died in the house belonging to the Oratorians at Brompton, and a relative of his, a Mr. Smee, petitioned this House with reference to the circumstances connected with the death of his relative and with respect to his funeral. When my Motion came on the next Session—in 1865—it happened that this Mr. Smee, who is the medical officer of the Bank of England, chose—without my knowledge—to write a letter to the Duchess of Norfolk with reference to one of her daughters, who was in a convent in France. I never heard anything about this letter until I received a printed copy of it, and found that it had been circulated. I deprecated that letter. I thought it in bad taste, and did all I could to prevent its circulation; but when my Motion for the consideration of the conventual question was before the House, up got three or four Roman Catholic Members in succession, who delivered themselves strongly against Mr. Smee and his letter, and endeavoured to connect me with it, although I had done all I could to stop its circulation. Some of my Friends were thus deluded into the belief I had something to do with it, just when they were entering the House to support my Motion; and under this they said delusion, it was a "blackguard business," and, although they had come down with the intention of voting for my Motion, they went away without voting at all. It is very probable that, in reference to the case, which I am now about to bring before the House, it will be said, that there is nothing in it but Mr. Murphy, and that I am come here for the purpose of setting Mr. Murphy up against the Secretary of State. Sir, if I thought I held a brief for any such purpose I would abandon it at once. But such is not the object of my Motion; and, in illustration of it, I think I cannot do better than read to the House a letter that was addressed to me by Mr. Roebuck, whose absence from this House I consider one of the greatest losses we have suffered during the late elections. I have been for twenty-six years in this House with Mr. Roebuck; he had been thirty-five years a Member of the House; and I know no one who, as a Member of the House—though I was opposed to him for many years, and we sat on opposite sides of the House—did more to elevate the character of this Assembly. What, then, does Mr. Roebuck say in reference to this matter? He was unable to attend the meeting in St. James's Hall, but he addressed the following letter to me as chairman of that meeting:—

"My dear Sir,—For the reasons I stated to you when we met, I shall not be able to attend your meeting. I am, indeed, sorry that this should be so, as I heartily concur with you in thinking that such a meeting is much needed under present circumstances, and that, if it be properly conducted, good—aye, much good—may result from it. As I understand you, the meeting has been called to express disapprobation of certain acts of the Home Secretary, which you believe to be—some of them illegal—all unjust and alarming, and forming mischievous precedents for the future. In this opinion of yours I concur; and I am the more alarmed, first, because the Home Secretary bears a high character for probity, kindness, and intelligence; and, secondly, because the arguments he uses to justify and palliate his conduct are just those plausible pretences which have always been employed to defend and excuse the beginnings of tyranny and oppression. Tyranny has not seldom begun in breaches of the law, which, though acknowledged to be breaches of the law, have been sought to be justified by necessity. *Salus populi suprema lex* is a favourite and convenient phrase upon such occasions. By it the first attacks on freedom are supposed to be justified, and the excuse accepted. But this is a step in the direction of illegality and despotism; another step soon follows; and by degrees, and these not slow degrees, freedom and safety are undermined, and despotism usurps the place of law and justice; certainty and security disappear; alarm, jealousy, and suspicion take possession of the public mind. Careless and confiding people will deem these fears frivolous and uncalled for. But if these consequences do not follow such proceedings as those of which we are speaking, it will be because the nation is watchful, and resents and marks with disapprobation these first hasty and unstatesmanlike deviations from the frank, loyal, straightforward course of a Constitutional Minister. By what I have said here, do not suppose that I am defending the conduct of Mr. Murphy. Of his doings, indeed, I can give no opinion, not knowing what he has done. I had learned by the papers that his speeches have not seldom been followed by violence and tumult. Mr. Murphy, it appears, has undertaken the task of explaining his own opinions of the Catholic religion, and of the conduct of some of its professors. As his views are unfavourable to that which he undertakes to describe, I can easily understand that his sayings are very disagreeable to Catholics generally. But though he may be rude of speech (I do not say that he is so), still there is no justification for a violent personal assault upon him—neither is it an excuse for that breach of the law by which it was attempted to silence him. For my own part, I very much dislike acrimonious religious discussion, and I frankly own I can sympathize with those who feel disgust and shame, when they hear of such scenes as are said to have taken place on the occasion of Mr. Murphy's lectures. This, however, is just the state of mind in which a powerful Minister should be most careful of his conduct and jealous of himself. I have no doubt but that Mr. Bruce thought Mr. Murphy a pestilent agitator."

["Hear."] Well, that seems to be the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Mr. Roebuck proceeds to say:—

"That, too, I suspect, was the state of mind of Leo X., when he thought of Luther. I know that I here am comparing small things with great, but the comparison is apt, and renders us all a very useful lesson. One observation more, and I have done. It may be said, that in the case of shutting up the lecture-rooms of Mr. Murphy and preventing his meetings no law was broken, as an old obsolete despotic law sanctioned the proceedings. This is true. But the acting upon this obsolete law was in reality a breach of the law, as it has been acted upon ever since the now obsolete law was passed: The law was passed in time of great danger and alarm, and has always by that party to which Mr. Bruce belongs been deemed a gross violation of constitutional freedom. And it must surprise and strike every thoughtful man, that in these palmy days of liberality, when we have a Prime Minister who is *par excellence* a Liberal, that despotic law of a Minister should be dug up from the grave, to which public prudence, shame, and indignation had assigned it, for the purpose of silencing a speaker whom you could not or would not answer:—I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

"J. A. ROEBUCK."

Now, Sir, it does strike me as very singular, that a Liberal Home Secretary should have availed himself of this law, the 9 & 10 *Vict.*, c. 33, which contains the substance of the Act of 1795, though limited in its operation to such cases as the Law Officers of the Crown will undertake. Mr. Fox and every Liberal of his day denounced the restrictions upon freedom of discussion, or rather of lecturing, which the statute of 1795 imposed; all those who inherit Mr. Fox's opinions have declared that this statute had been very properly consigned to oblivion. I believe they would have repealed this statute long since had it been remembered by these Liberals. By whom was that Act of 1795 modified? By whom was the administration of it limited to the Government? By the late Mr. Duncombe, a man of undoubted Liberal principles, an adherent of the opinions of Mr. Fox. But what has occurred! The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department has declared, that recently there has been an emergency. He seemed, indeed, to imagine that there was a parallel between some emergency which the riots that attended some of Murphy's lectures had created, and the circumstances which preceded the passing of the Act of 1795. What, Sir, were the circumstances of that period? It occurred about two years and a-half after the King of France had been beheaded; about two years after the commencement of the Reign of Terror in France; and when the principles of the French Revolution had obtained considerable hold, not only among the Roman Catholics but among the Presbyterians of Ireland. In those days there was a real rebellion brewing in Ireland; England herself was in a most unsafe position. Really dangerous opinions were propagated throughout the country in lecture-halls, and infected the minds of the people, who were subjected to a heavy pressure by the circumstances occasioned by the external war then raging, and by the seasons, which were unfavourable. Some of the English people, stimulated by foreign agents, gave way to disloyalty, and George III, when coming down to the House of Lords to open Parliament, was fired at in his carriage. Under these circumstances was it that the Act of 1795 was passed, simultaneously with an Act for the protection of the Crown and person of His Majesty. Will the right hon. Gentleman say that there is any parallel between the circumstances of last year, between the emergency which he supposes to have lately existed, and the emergency which induced Mr. Pitt to pass this law?—notwithstanding which emergency Mr. Fox and the party with whom the right hon. Gentleman is now supposed to be connected denounced the measure as an act of tyranny? But these are not the whole of the circumstances of the case. And here, Sir, permit me to observe that I speak in disparagement of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman with regret; for there is no Member of the Government for whom, personally, I entertain a higher respect than I do for the right hon. Gentleman; and I am convinced that some very urgent pressure must have been put on the right hon. Gentleman to induce him to act as he has done. I have reason for thinking that some influence must have been used to bias his better judgment, or he would never have recourse to this obsolete Act for the suppression of—what? Of sedition! Will any man come forward and produce in this House the record of any lecture ever delivered by Mr. Murphy in the sense of the lectures against the dissemination of which this Act was originally directed? Will any man in this House, or elsewhere, produce proof that, whatever this man's imperfections in other respects may be, he was ever guilty of sedition? And yet the Preamble of this statute, which has been used against Mr. Murphy and his lectures, declares that it is an Act to be applied only against seditious, nay, treasonable meetings. A Question was put to the right hon. Gentleman in this House by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Mr. Aytoun) this Session, inquiring whether it was true that the right hon. Gentleman, as Home Secretary, had ordered the closing of these lecture-halls, or rather had authorized the virtual closing of them against Mr. Murphy and his audiences; for it rested with him only to authorize the local authorities to threaten the infliction of a fine of £100 upon any owner of a hall who opened it, and the infliction of a fine of £10, I think, upon any person who might attend the lecture therein; and this, mind you, in some cases, without any sworn information of an apprehended riot. Well, the right hon. Gentleman, in answering this Question, spoke of Mr. Murphy as "delivering one of his inflammatory lectures at Tynemouth, and the result was much violence and some bloodshed." One might have supposed that it was one of those lectures which were delivered in 1795. But no; it was a Protestant lecture, and that was the offence! Then the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "That being so, I did not hesitate to put in force an Act which I quite admit is one only to be used in extreme cases."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcv. 759.]

What are we to consider an "extreme case?" It seems that the right hon. Gentleman considers it an "extreme case" when a lecture is delivered in a hall with closed doors — a lecture, the substance of which may be distasteful to some persons, who need not enter the hall, who have no business in that hall, if they do not like the announced substance of the lecture. Is that to be considered an "extreme case?" The right hon. Gentleman then went on to say—

> "The case here was one which, in my opinion, justified its application—that of the Statute 9 & 10 Victoria. Here is a man, who, for no good purpose whatever, goes about exciting the peaceful inhabitants of these towns in such a way as to lead to acts of violence, creating dissension and disorder wherever he appears; and as long as there are means of repression known to the law"—

These words have been taken as of peculiar signification, and I beg attention to them—

> "as long as there are means of repression known to the law, I think it is the duty of those charged with the preservation of the peace to use them. It was therefore under my directions and on my responsibility that the Mayor of Tynemouth made known that all persons attending these lectures would be liable to a penalty."—[*Ibid.*]

Sir, the right hon. Gentleman has undertaken to say that these Protestant lectures do no good; and that may be his opinion. But there is no such definition as that in law. If there were, the substance of these lectures would be actionable; but there has never yet been an attempt made to prosecute this Mr. Murphy for anything he has uttered. Then, again, when this man had been arrested in Birmingham, the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds (Mr. Greene), who has written to me — but I fear he will reach town too late for this Morning's Sitting — put a Question with respect to the arrest of Mr. Murphy at Birmingham to the right hon. Gentleman, who, in reply, said—

> "Murphy was arrested, bail was taken for him, and he appeared before the magistrates, who dismissed the case. No information was laid, and consequently none could be produced."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcvii. 411.]

I did not know, and it was not known in Birmingham, with certainty, that there was no information, until the right hon. Gentleman declared there was none. None was produced before the magistrate. There was a charge on the police sheet of an intention on the part of Mr. Murphy to disturb the town's meeting, which he desired to attend; but no attempt was made to support that charge. The stipendiary magistrate asked whether or not there was a sworn information; and the right hon. Gentleman informed us that there was none. He then proceeded to say—

> "He had been unable to discover that the Mayor of Birmingham acted under any Act of Parliament or had legal sanction for what he did; he appeared to have acted on the basis of *Salus populi suprema lex,* and to have undergone some considerable personal hazard for the purpose of averting a popular danger."—[*Ibid.*]

Why, Sir, the justice of the peace who ventures to act upon the doctrine *Salus populi suprema lex,* and to arrest a person against whom there is no sworn information ought to have under his personal view the danger of an insurrection or riot, and that the person he arrests is promoting that riot. I have had to act as a magistrate in very tumultuous times. During the year 1842 I was acting in the presence of mobs, amounting to 5,000 and 6,000, and many of them strangers to the locality; I knew that I could not order the arrest of any person in them, unless I myself saw and was prepared to swear that there was immediate danger of a breach of the peace, owing to the presence and action of such person. Now, there was nothing of the sort at Birmingham. The arrest of Murphy was contemplated some days before. And what happened? Before this man could enter the Town Hall—though he was a rate-payer and had a ticket for the meeting—he was arrested in the lobby by an order, which, it appears, came from the Mayor. What right had the Mayor to assume that there was danger of a breach of the peace in the meeting from the presence of this man, who had never entered the meeting? This arrest constitutes an act which I should not have supposed the right hon. Gentleman would think of justifying by quoting the maxim *Salus populi suprema lex.* That is a maxim which has been used to cover acts of tyranny of the blackest dye. This is a kind of language which the Home Secretary ought to be very careful in using, when he knows that his words go forth with authority to officials who are not deeply versed in the law, many of whom have had little experience in dealing with assemblies which they may mistakenly consider to be illegal. I do not deny there was a great disturbance in the Town Hall at Birmingham; but I believe that this arrest of Mr. Murphy aggravated, if it did not create, that disturbance. This arrest virtually excluded a considerable number of persons from the Hall, and created in the minds of others a sense of oppression on the one side, and of undue favour and of exultation on the other. There never was such a scene in the Town Hall at Birmingham as took place on that occasion. The meeting had been called in support of the measure which the House has just passed relating to the Irish Church. At that meeting a letter was read from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, upon which I will only say that the expressions it contained with regard to the House of Lords and their functions were not analogous to those which have to-day fallen from the Prime Minister. Sir, that letter was of itself quite sufficient to excite a breach of the peace; but Mr. Murphy was not the author of that letter. He was not even in the hall. He was only in the lobby, and the Mayor could not possibly have known what would be the effect of his presence. Mr. Murphy was not seen there, and the Mayor could have formed no judgment by personal view of his conduct on the occasion. I should not have thought that the Mayor would have been alarmed at the entrance of any person into the Town Hall of Birmingham whilst he occupied the chair. But the Mayor of Birmingham acting upon the timid policy which has been recommended by the Home Secretary, but in the sense of *Salus populi suprema lex,* ordered Mr. Murphy to be locked up, from the fear that he would come into a town's meeting of which his Worship was the chairman! Such conduct on the part of a municipal officer, however, is not after all so surprising as that the Home Secretary, in his place in Parliament, should quote such a maxim as this in justification of conduct, that I cannot think either wise or lawful. This person, Mr. Murphy, was I understand, at the meeting to which I have referred, and over which I presided. He sat I believe, behind me somewhere, but he took no part in the proceedings, and to this hour I do not know the man by sight. Now, that which particularly concerns this House is, what has been the conduct of other Home Secretaries in analogous cases? Have we any precedent in the action of other Home Secretaries for such an extraordinary stretch of power; any precedent for this extraordinary departure from the usual rules of constitutional law, which guard the right of freedom of speech, freedom of meeting, and freedom of discussion? It does happen that the case of this person has been frequently brought before the notice of this House. In the year 1867, this person, who is now a resident in Birmingham, desired to deliver some lectures there and to hold religious services; and there was a great deal of opposition to his doing so. His friends erected a temporary building for his accommodation. But on the Sunday morning, when he and his friends were going for the first time to use this structure for Divine worship, they were attacked in the streets and assaulted by an organized Roman Catholic mob, and, in anticipation of this, some of the Roman Catholic priests, it appears, manifested their discretion by closing their chapels. Mr. Murphy was attacked. His friends, too, were wounded on that Sunday morning. When the matter came to my knowledge, I went to the President of the Board of Trade and asked him if he knew anything about it; but he said he knew nothing. A friend of mine, in whom I could place reliance, then went down to Birmingham, and reported to me by letter what was the commencement of that disturbance; I have found that his report was perfectly accurate. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) was Home Secretary; and a Question was put to him by the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for the Colonial Department (Mr. Monsell) upon the subject. It was a leading Question, leading up to some such conduct as has been unhappily pursued by the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State. And what did the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) answer? He said—

> "No legal proceedings could, however, be taken in respect of the language which had been used, because it would not of itself necessarily lead to a breach of the peace; but he could not say how much he regretted that such language had been used."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxviii. 88.]

This was an attempt on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for the Colonies to induce the late Home Secretary to admit that there was danger to the public peace; and that was the reply he got. This took place in this House on the 19th of June, 1867. Again, on the 20th of June, 1867, being the day after the Question had been put to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) put a Question, and the reply, which I take from *Hansard*, was in these terms. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I do not think that he (Mr. Murphy) is deprived—I do not think that anything I have said could justify the inference that he is to be deprived of the right of protection in a place built by him and others for the purposes of these lectures; because the words were not criminal words in themselves, or words that could be legally taken notice of."—[*Ibid.* 175.]

We find, too, that on the 3rd of July, 1867, in answer to the hon. Member for Peterborough, the late Home Secretary said—

> "The other question was as to any steps which might be taken with respect to the discourses delivered at Birmingham. Upon that point he said he did not think that there were any grounds for criminal proceedings."—[*Ibid.* 925.]

Subsequently, on the 15th of May, 1868, a Question was put to the right hon. Gentleman by a person who was then a Member of this House, Mr. Rearden. We all remember Mr. Rearden—who was supposed to be a man of very advanced opinions—

> "Mr. Rearden said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it be his intention to introduce a Bill this Session for the purpose of preventing lectures upon the religious profession of faith of any of Her Majesty's subjects in any part of the United Kingdom, except in Churches and Chapels licensed for that purpose, and during Divine Service in such Churches and Chapels, without first submitting a copy of such lecture for the approval, revision, and consent of the Secretary of State for the Home Department?"

Such was the suggestion made in the form of a Question by Mr. Rearden. To this the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hardy) answered—

> "Sir, I have no intention of introducing such a Bill; and I must protest against adding to the duties of Secretary of State for the Home Department the approval or revision of lectures upon religious subjects."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcii. 346.]

The present Home Secretary does not appear to have undertaken the consideration or revision of Mr. Murphy's lectures. What he has done was to go beforehand and stop the mouth of a person not in the act of delivering a lecture, but who, as he has said, he feared would deliver an irritating lecture. Sir, the contrast between the conduct of the late Home Secretary and that of the right hon. Gentleman who has succeeded him with regard to this matter of freedom of discussion is very marked. But it does not stop here. What we have now to do with is the question of personal freedom. Some riots had occurred at Ashton-under-Lyne and other places. These riots were made by Roman Catholic mobs, incited, in several instances, by Roman Catholic priests. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) made a speech in this House with a view of commending the subject in the most stringent form to the attention of the late Home Secretary, and this was the reply, as I find it reported in *Hansard*, of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gathorne Hardy). The date is the 25th of May, 1868—

> "Now, as I understand, the mode which is adopted by Mr. Murphy when he is going to lecture at a place is either to hire a room for the purpose, or to make use of a building which belongs to him, and to which persons are admitted by ticket. There is no analogy in such proceedings to meetings held in the open air, and I am not aware that there is any law in existence by which a person can be prevented from delivering controversial lectures, either in a room which he takes or a structure which he carries about for the purpose. . . . The hon. Member (Mr. Maguire) said he should be averse from any interference with free discussion; but I am afraid, unless you were to impose a limit with regard to the language used, which would be found intolerable, you must rely, under the present law, on the moderation of those who lecture, and on the authority of persons of influence on their side, whether in religion or politics, to make them temperate in the language they employ. I am not able to say, therefore,"

—and this is the point to which I would particularly call the attention of hon. Members—

> "I am not able to say, therefore, that I contemplate any mode by which persons going to deliver controversial lectures, which in themselves are not wrong, in buildings which are their own or are hired, can be prevented from doing so."—[*Ibid.* 823-4.]

This is a most clear and distinct declaration, and I believe it to be thoroughly sound in law. I will assign my reasons for thinking so hereafter. Again, on the 29th of May, 1868, in answer to the hon. Member for Peterborough, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) said—

> "Everyone, so long as he did not commit a breach of the peace, being entitled to the protection of the law. As regards controversy, no one would protect its freedom in religion and politics more thoroughly than I would do so. I think every man has a right to put forward his own creed, and to support it with such arguments as he may think proper; but I do not think it advisable to put forth inflammatory placards, containing language calculated to provoke a breach of the peace—language insulting, and, no doubt, in many instances, meant to be insulting, to people professing other creeds."—[*Ibid.* 1094.]

Now, Sir, I adduce these extracts, because I heard the answers myself, and it was in consequence of my having watched the effect of these answers upon the late House of Commons, and the approbation with which they were received by the House, which induced me to feel extreme surprise when I heard the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department to the question of the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds (Mr. Greene). I then conceived that it would be my duty to bring the matter under the notice of the House. I have consulted with no mean authorities on constitutional law. I have already laid before the House the opinion of Mr. Roebuck, and I might state the opinions of other lawyers; but Mr. Roebuck is a Queen's Counsel, and all whom I have consulted agree that the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, in using this Act of the 9 & 10 *Vict.* for the suppression of these lectures, is not only the perversion of an Act of Parliament, but is virtually, if not literally, an infraction of the law. I cannot believe, indeed, that the Colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman are not conscious in some degree of the accuracy of what I say. For it is a significant fact that when the Newspaper Bill went up to the House of Lords it was found to contain a clause for the repeal of this very statute. I say this on the authority of Lord Cairns, the late Lord Chancellor, who expressed his surprise that this House should have seemed to countenance the exercise of arbitrary power under this Act, and that the Ministry, who had sanctioned the exercise by their officials of this arbitrary power should, within four days of doing so, have introduced a Bill for the repeal of the very statute under which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department had been acting. This led to some discussion in the House of Lords, and the present Lord Chancellor endeavoured to apologize for the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman; and a very lame apology, I am sorry to say, it was. Because, whether it was right or wrong to use this statute; whether it was a law that was properly applicable to the circumstances; whether the emergency was sufficient to justify the use of such a law, and whether the lecturer, Murphy, could be considered guilty of sedition or not, this at least is clear, that if it were a law, and a useful law, it ought to have been preserved for the use of other Home Secretaries. But what did the present Government do? They used this statute, and then immediately afterwards repealed it. I have never been a Member of any Government; but if I were, and I had Colleagues who induced me to first abuse the law and then within four days proposed to repeal that very statute under the powers of which I had acted, I should not, I think, be much inclined to submit to such treatment. This one fact seems to me enough to condemn the proceedings of the Government. Why should they propose the repeal of a law which they had just enforced, if they considered it a just law? That proposal on the part of the Government was, to my mind, a confession that the invocation of that statute was an action that they cannot justify. I wish to speak without any disrespect of the authorities at Birmingham—they seem to have been incited by this strange conduct on the part of the Government. I have been told that what occurred at Birmingham is *sub judice*, and, as an action for false imprisonment has been threatened, I ought not to refer to it. But, Sir, I have ascertained what is the actual position of the case. The case was brought before the stipendiary magistrate of Birmingham after Mr. Murphy had been locked up all night in a cell in the principal establishment of police. He was next morning taken before the magistrate, who happens fortunately to be a very good lawyer, Mr. Kynnersley. The first question put was—"What is the charge?" The police sheet was produced. "Charged with attempting to disturb a public meeting." Why, the man had never entered it! No wonder, then, that there was nobody to support the charge. "Where is the information?" asked the magistrate. The police said they did not know. "Then," said Mr. Kynnersley, there is no charge;" and he ordered the prisoner to be immediately liberated. As I have before remarked, the meeting at Birmingham was very tumultuous, but it could not have been so on account of Mr. Murphy's presence but rather on account of his absence. ["Oh," *and* "Hear!"] That, at all events, is the information given to me. His arrest produced intense irritation amongst many of his friends who were in the meeting, and a corresponding degree of exultation amongst the other party, to whom it imparted the feeling that they might do just as they pleased; and the result was that they overpowered the Mayor. They listened to the Mayor from the first with impatience, they heard Mr. Thomas Lloyd, the proposer, and they heard the seconder of the Resolution in favour of disestablishing the Irish Church; but from that moment the meeting was one continued scene of uproar and disorder. Previous to the meeting Mr. Sampson Lloyd, one of the most distinguished citizens of Birmingham, eminent in position and education, and capable of speaking in a manner of which I sincerely wish this House had an opportunity of judging, had communicated with the Mayor and arranged that he should move an Amendment to test the opinion of the town meeting. He also sent to the Mayor the names of those who were to speak in support of the Amendment. The Mayor acceded to the arrangement, but the excitement of the audience, whether increased by the unjust arrest of Murphy or not—and I have a right to say it was an unjust arrest when no information was produced, and although a charge was entered on the police sheet no attempt was made to support it—aggravated, I think, by that unjust arrest, the meeting utterly repudiated the authority of the chairman, and for two hours there was a continuous scene of hubbub and tumult. Can it be said, that such a scene of hubbub was favourable to freedom of discussion? This tumult was caused by the mob, which afterwards attacked Mr. Murphy in the street, as they had attacked him before. It was this mob which broke the windows of the house in which he lived—it was this same mob, I say, which set the Mayor of Birmingham at defiance after he had ordered the arrest of Murphy. I have here the details and a full catalogue of the attacks which have been from time to time in various localities made on this man and his friends, but I will not trouble the House with them. I find, however, in these accounts that there were Roman Catholic priests who urged their congregations to attack this person and those who were with him, as well as other Protestants who attended his lectures. I have heard the details of a very questionable act committed by the stipendiary magistrate at Manchester. I have been much struck by the analogy between these attempts at the suppression of free discussion, these violent outbreaks to prevent persons from lecturing in public, and those which occurred before the civil war in the United States. The other day there was a similar occurrence in Ireland. One Sunday some Methodists met for Divine worship in a gentleman's private park, when they were attacked, outraged, wounded, and hunted from the place. In Scotland, also, there have been two cases of the like kind within the last three weeks—one at Dundee and the other at Glasgow. Judging by what has happened in Ireland, and what has happened in the United States, I have no hesitation in declaring, that if encouragement is given to this system of outrage by Roman Catholic mobs—if these matters are allowed to grow, we shall have to do just what our American cousins did—turn out and put them down ourselves. If the authorities will not stay a riot, then the inhabitants of the neighbourhood have a right to take the part of the persons assailed. I am lawyer enough to know that. If you see a man put in danger of his life, or suffering outrage, it is your duty as one of the Queen's lieges to protect him, and this is a duty which we should not neglect. I hope the House will forgive me for bringing this matter under its consideration, because, whether the right hon. Gentleman can justify the course he has pursued or not, I am sure the House will agree with me, that the conduct of the Government in these matters is unprecedented; that the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman in respect of this statute—or late statute, as I believe it to be by this time, and the conduct of the Government, of which he is a Member, in inducing or permitting him to abuse the power given by that very questionable law, ought to be held, to say the least of it, exceptional. Judging of the effects produced in my own district by the declarations made in this House and published upon the temper of the Roman Catholics, especially in Birmingham, and from what I hear of the probable action of civic authorities who believe that they will be supported as the Mayors of Tynemouth and other places have been supported by the right hon. Gentleman, I deem it to be my duty, though I am a Tory and the right hon. Gentleman is the Home Secretary of a Liberal Government, to submit my Motion to the House in terms of the Notice.

MR. HOLT seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the right of free speech is one of the most important safeguards of good Government, and that attacks upon this right are, therefore, dangerous to the welfare of the State:—That the recent conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in preventing free discussion of important topics was, in fact, an attack upon this great safeguard of freedom; and is, therefore, deserving of reprehension by this House:—That this conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department has proved especially mischievous, since it has led to breaches of the law on the part of official persons, more particularly by the Mayor of Birmingham, who caused the arrest of an innocent person for the purpose of preventing what to him was distasteful discussion,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. DIXON said, he entirely approved of the course which had been taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department in reference to the matter introduced to the notice of the House by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). With regard to the first declaration in the Resolution of the hon. Member, it was unnecessary with reference either to the Mayor and authorities of Birmingham or, he should hope, to any part of this country. The Resolution further stated that the Mayor of Birmingham had caused the arrest of an innocent person for the purpose of preventing, what to him, was a distasteful discussion. Now he (Mr. Dixon) was not present at the meeting to which the hon. Gentleman had referred, and he had had no communication with the Mayor of Birmingham on the subject; but he thought, from the knowledge he had acquired, that the hon. Gentleman was under an entire misconception as to the facts of the case. The sole object the Mayor of Birmingham had in the course he took was to prevent what seemed to him likely to lead to a disturbance of the peace. A more impartial and fair-dealing man as a politician, as well as a private individual, than the Mayor of Birmingham, he (Mr. Dixon) was not acquainted with. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the proceedings which had taken place at Birmingham in 1867 with reference to Mr. Murphy. The disturbances which had occurred were well known to the whole country. Mr. Murphy was known before he came to Birmingham to have caused breaches of the peace elsewhere, or, at all events, what he did and said was known to have preceded breaches of the peace which would not otherwise have occurred. It was apprehended, therefore, that the same breaches of the peace might happen in Birmingham, and what occurred was a justification. There was a breach of the peace and a riot of no small dimensions. He (Mr. Dixon) was Mayor at the time, and had to read the Riot Act in the presence of 100,000 persons. Mr. Murphy had built a place in which to deliver lectures which were highly objectionable to many persons, and a number of Roman Catholics had thrown stones at a house occupied by one of the friends of Mr. Murphy, but he believed the main damage which ensued from the disturbance was caused by those who took Mr. Murphy's part. Not unnaturally, when Mr. Murphy made his appearance again in Birmingham, it was thought that such a firebrand appearing at a meeting called to consider the Irish Church Bill might lead to a breach of the peace. It was not till Mr. Sampson Lloyd got up to speak that the disturbance really commenced. The alleged disturbance of the meeting, in spite of the arrest, was simply an indisposition on the part of the meeting to listen to Mr. Sampson Lloyd, those present knowing well what his opinions were. He thought the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) was entirely misinformed as to what took place at this meeting, and he felt persuaded that there was an entire misapprehension as to the course taken by the Mayor of Birmingham.

Mr. WHALLEY expressed his satisfaction that this outrage had been brought under the attention of the House by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). The House had now for the first time heard of "Mr." Murphy. Formerly he was Murphy the firebrand, Murphy the agitator, and so on; but now he was treated with some little respect. Some two years ago Mr. Murphy appeared in Birmingham as a Protestant lecturer, and the hon. Member (Mr. Dixon), not content with protecting the Town Hall, set the police to prohibit, by all the influence and power of the Corporation, the use by Mr. Murphy of any other public building for the delivery of his lectures. A building, however, was erected by Mr. Murphy at his own cost, and afterwards riots of a disgraceful character ensued. Instead, however, of their being "Murphy riots," he was in no way responsible for them, because they began even before he had opened his mouth. They were got up by Roman Catholics, who were liberated from their chapels on that particular Sunday for the purpose of creating a riot; and after two or three days of saturnalia, the Superintendent of Police reported to the Mayor that but for the intervention of Mr. Murphy and the people over whom he possessed an influence, the town of Birmingham would probably have been sacked and set on fire. Therefore, those riots, originating with Roman Catholics, were suppressed by Protestants acting under the direction of Mr. Murphy. He (Mr. Whalley) had felt it to be his duty to stand by the side of Mr. Murphy before the magistrate at Birmingham, and to ask for the ground of complaint against him. He received no other answer except this—that he (Mr. Whalley) would be held responsible if Mr. Murphy remained in the town. Be it recollected that though Mr. Murphy had been denied the use of the Town Hall, a fortnight previously Dr. Manning had been allowed to lecture in it, and had received no interruption, though he uttered many things which were calculated to excite the anger of Protestants. He (Mr. Whalley) did not suppose that the Secretary of State for the Home Department would justify a proceeding calculated to suppress freedom of discussion, on the ground that the principles advocated by Mr. Murphy were opposed to those of the Government. It was not true, as had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, that Mr. Murphy was a person who went about the country for seditious purposes. He had known Mr. Murphy for years, and he believed him to be honest and truthful. It was true that the newspapers of the metropolis tried to make him out to be a dangerous agitator, but it was now tolerably well known that the newspapers of the metropolis were all more or less under the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood. It was the boast of the *Weekly Register* that every gentleman in the Reporters' Gallery, every writer in the newspapers, was completely under that influence. Why was Mr. Murphy to be branded as an agitator, when he never spoke a word which was not loyal and patriotic? The right hon. Gentleman had said that Mr. Murphy was going about for no good purpose; but who, he should like to know, constituted the right hon. Gentleman a judge as to what was or was not a good purpose? He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman had estimated the gravity of the question. It was not Mr. Murphy who ever created disturbances; he merely quoted from Roman Catholic books the doctrines which the Roman Catholics were bound to believe, and then came the row, then the riot. He called upon the Secretary of State to prove what he had stated—namely, that Mr. Murphy went about for no good purpose, and that any one who attended his meetings was liable to a penalty of £20.

MR. G. H. MOORE said, he wished to ask the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) what were the expressions of which he complained as used by Dr. Manning, and which he said were usually applied by Roman Catholics to Protestants. He should also be glad to know what the hon. Member intended by the phrase, "the Roman Catholics were let loose from their chapels."

MR. WHALLEY said, Dr. Manning had called all Protestants "heathens;" and associated them with all the very worst attributes of heathenism. What he meant by saying that the Roman Catholics were "let loose from their chapels" was that, as stated by the Inspector of Police in his official Report, the chapel service was not held at the usual time, being that which Mr. Murphy had advertised for the commencement of his lecture.

MR. BRUCE said, that any hon. Gentleman who addressed the House in behalf of the right of free speech had a very great advantage. In that sacred right all sides of the House were equally interested. He did not doubt that his hon. Friend who introduced this Motion was a vigilant guardian of the right, but at the same time he might be permitted to suggest that if the interference now complained of had occurred to a Roman Catholic lecturer, who had been going about inflaming the public mind, and leading to violence, destruction of property, and bloodshed, the House would not have the benefit of hearing his hon. Friend for a hour and a-half on the subject. He need not say that in the performance of his duty, as regarded Mr. Murphy, he could have but one motive—that of the preservation of the public peace. It was nothing to him whence the danger came; if the danger existed, and if he was armed with powers to prevent it, it was his duty to exercise them. Let them look at the facts of this particular case in order to see whether he had properly exercised the powers which the law gave him, he admitted, under very peculiar circumstances. Towards the end of March last he received from the Mayor of Tynemouth an announcement that Mr. Murphy had advertised a certain meeting to be held at South Shields, and that the Orangemen were going to have a procession on Easter Monday, which, in the opinion of the Mayor of Tynemouth would probably lead to violence and bloodshed, and he inquired how he should proceed. He gave him the advice of his predecessor in Office—that he should do his best by appealing to those who were about to join in the procession to abstain from doing so. He was happy to say that in that appeal the Mayor had succeeded. With respect to the meeting of Murphy, he informed the Mayor there was nothing in the common law to prevent him from holding it in private rooms, but inasmuch as danger was apprehended he advised the Mayor to have a force of special constables and put himself in communication with the military, in case of any serious riot, to have the means of suppressing it. All these means were taken very energetically. On the day when the meeting was held, as the Mayor had apprehended, large numbers of Irishmen were assembled—not only of those residing at South Shields, but others came in trains from several neighbouring towns, and then occurred a scene which was described by the Mayor; but the House must recollect it was not on this occasion that he had interposed in what was called an illegal manner. The first lecture of Murphy was given under these circumstances—

> "As Mr. Murphy began his lecture, which was numerously attended, at eight o'clock, there was at that time a large crowd gathered, and at the east end of West Saville Street a large number of Irishmen were assembled. The magistrates, who had had information that an attack was threatened, had a large force of men in reserve at the police station, and were in telegraphic communication with all the military in case they should be needed. All passed off quietly till between half-past eight and a-quarter to nine o'clock, when the Irishmen, who had kept together at the east end of West Saville Street, suddenly disappeared, and immediately after a large body of Irish, 200 or 300 were seen coming up the Borough Road in military array, headed by two leaders. They were all armed—some with sticks, others with hammers—and proceeded shouting into Saville Street—'We'll kill Murphy; suppose we are hung for it,' and uttering other threats. The crowd about the door fled before them, and as there were only four policemen inside the passage leading to the Odd-Fellows' Hall, who believed that the rioters were about to break in upon the meeting, they shut and locked the front door to exclude them. As soon as the Irishmen got in front of the Hall they fell into line. Their two leaders gave a shout, and threw two large stones at the windows of the Odd-Fellows' Hall. Two or three volleys followed, which smashed in the windows, and caused great alarm to those in the interior, some of whom were struck by the missiles, and one man is reported to be somewhat seriously wounded, a large iron slug having hit him. From the outside the assembly in the hall could be heard pouring down stairs; and fortunately, the front door being locked, they could not be attacked by the exasperated Irish outside, who attempted to smash in the doors with sticks and hammers. There being an egress from the back, the large body of the assembly got into a back street and so escaped. The whole of the audience however, did not take flight, but not more than one-sixth remained, Murphy calling upon them to stand firm. The most of them made to the platform, which became crowded, and they broke up the chairs, and armed themselves with the legs and backs to receive the charge. More stones came into the room through the broken windows, but the policemen had effectually barred the entrance of the Irish from the outside, and Murphy and his supporters retained possession of the room in comparative safety. In the meantime a messenger had been sent to the police station for the reserve force, and, on arriving, headed by Mr. Superintendent Hewit, they charged the Irishmen who fled in all directions. There were three contingents of them—one coming by the steam ferry from South Shields and Jarrow, another by the ten minutes past eight train from Howden and Walker, the third men belonging to the town."

That was the result of the first meeting. Murphy then went northwards, intending to address audiences in some of the principal towns of the north; but, on all occasions, he was refused permission to lecture in large places. He returned to Tynemouth, and gave notice that he intended to resume his meetings. It was known that wherever this man had gone, at Ashton, Staleybridge, Birmingham—outrages similar to those described—similar, but much worse—had occurred. In all cases the religious feelings of the Roman Catholics had been outraged, their outbreaks had led to retaliation, and from one cause or another, there had been great danger to life and destruction of property. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire asked what harm was there in going about to preach Protestant doctrines; and the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) said this man's motives were high and pure, and therefore he should not have been interfered with. He hoped both hon. Members were ignorant of the nature of this person's addresses. At first the subjects were simply theological—"The Scapular and the Blessed Virgin Mary coming down from Heaven to release Souls out of Purgatory;" "Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass unscriptural;" "The Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome unscriptural." The charge for attendance at these theological lectures was 2*d.* and 4*d.* Then there was also a series which this pure and simple-minded man delivered at North Shields upon "The Confessional Unmasked; Maynooth and its Teaching," the advertisement being accompanied with the notice that the lecture would be addressed to "gentlemen only, gentlemen under eighteen years of age not being admitted." He quite approved of the Juvenalian maxim—

> "Maxima debetur pueris reverentia."

But on Saturday, March 20, the subject announced was "The Confessional Unmasked"—to ladies only. On these occasions this Apostle of Truth appreciated the superior attractions of his subjects, and the charge was 6*d.* and 1*s.* Was it to be wondered that lectures on such subjects delivered in such circumstances, impeaching the morality of Catholic priests and people, should have led to proceedings which they must all deplore? On the threatened return of Murphy to South Shields he (Mr. Bruce) was again applied to by the Mayor, who apprehended similar scenes, the Irish threatening to attend in much greater numbers. Such was the state of alarm that the question was whether the Volunteers should be called out. He then found he had a weapon at his disposal, which the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) called obsolete, but which was one that the hon. Gentleman had himself assisted in forging, since he was a Member of the House when it passed. [Mr. NEWDEGATE: It was limited in its application.] The difference between the old Act and the one recently modified was that formerly anyone could lay an information against any person who lectured, even on Shaksperian subjects, whereas the powers conferred by the recent Act could not be exercised by any individual, but only by the Crown and the law. On the statement of facts laid before him he took the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, and asked them whether he should be justified in putting the Act in force. They advised him of the legality of so doing. The hon. Member had argued this case as if it were an attempt to prevent a meeting from being held, whereas the fact was that it was done to prevent the return of Murphy to a place where he had previously been the occasion of a disturbance. On receiving the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown he informed the Mayor of Tynemouth that he would be authorized under the Act to give notice to the owner of the lecture-hall that he would be liable to a penalty of £100 if the meeting was held in an unlicensed room, and that any person who attended it would be liable to a penalty of £20. The law was not put in force, for the threat was effectual. Mr. Murphy disappeared, but re-appeared in other places, where new disturbances arose. He was not there to justify the law—indeed, he admitted that it was altogether unsuitable to these times. The question, however, was whether, being responsible for the peace of the country, he would have been justified in abstaining from using the weapon which the Legislature had placed in his hands, and he could not admit that his judgment ought to have been influenced by the fact that they were all of opinion that the law ought to be repealed. The hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to connect him with the proceedings of the Mayor of Birmingham. The Mayor had not, however, consulted him, and what the Mayor did was on his own responsibility. The answer he had given in the House, on a recent occasion, was derived from the letter of the Mayor himself. He knew that the Mayor had subjected himself to an action which he believed had since been commenced. He had expressed no approval of the conduct of the Mayor, nor did he say that it had been legal.

MR. MUNTZ said, it was impossible that the Mayor of Birmingham could have allowed a man to lecture in the Town Hall who had been causing riots in every town in the country. The only mistake made by the Mayor was in not seeing the necessity of having the informations filed before issuing his warrant. Murphy applied for the use of the Town Hall, which could be granted for the purpose of a public meeting either by the Mayor, or by two magistrates, or by six members of the Town Council. They all refused, and Murphy could not get the use of the Town Hall. Some of the magistrates and members of the Town Council were Roman Catholics. Murphy then built what he called his Tabernacle on a piece of waste land, and the Mayor kept a large body of police and some dragoons in readiness for four days to protect Murphy against the assaults of those who were enraged by his obscene and disgusting language. The fact was that Murphy was a violent agitator, with whom reasonable men, of whatever creed, could have no sympathy.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, the House must wish to get rid of these acrimonious ecclesiastical discussions. The reason why he and others supported the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) was not from any feeling of antagonism to the Roman Catholic religion, but because the right of free speech was involved in this question. He regretted that, on the afternoon when words of peace and conciliation had gone forth to their Roman Catholic brethren, the Secretary of State for the Home Department should have appealed to the religious prejudices both of the Catholics and the Protestants. Of course if a man went into a public place and used insulting language towards persons of other religious or political opinions, the State had a right to interfere, but he (Viscount Sandon) held that people should be free to hold meetings in closed rooms, whatever opinions they desired to express, and this freedom should be equally enjoyed whether by Protestants or Roman Catholics, by Tories or Radicals. He believed that the law of the country protected such meetings. With reference to the arrest of Mr. Murphy, he should have expected that the Minister of Justice in this country would have uttered some expression of his deep regret that the liberty of the subject had been interfered with, and he was sorry that no such expression had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. He felt that in supporting his hon. Friend he was standing up for a great constitutional principle, which it was equally the interest of Gentlemen on the other side of the House to support. He should vote for the Motion simply on the ground of the enormous importance of freedom of speech; and because under a very democratic government there was an evident danger that in the future opinions distasteful to the majority might run the risk of being suppressed with the strong hand. Almost every opinion worth having had been the opinion of a minority at one time or other, and but for the law would doubtless have been crushed out by a triumphant majority.

Mr. DOWNING took exception to the language which had been used by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) and the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley). It was hoped that the proceedings of that day would have been a message of peace to Ireland; but, after the imputations made in the course of the debate upon the Roman Catholic clergy, it seemed hopeless to expect any such result. He asked the hon. Member for Peterborough for the names of those Roman Catholic clergymen whom he had charged with inciting their parishioners to riot. Without knowing any of those rev. gentlemen, his confidence in the order to which they belonged was such as to justify him in using the strongest language in condemnation of the charge.

It being now ten minutes to Seven of the clock, debate *adjourned* till *this day.*

TURNPIKES.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he desired to appeal to the hon. Member for North Wiltshire (Sir George Jenkinson), who had given Notice of a Motion on this subject for the Evening Sitting, not to proceed with it, as he could obtain no practical result, and the Secretary of State for the Home Department had announced his intention of fully considering the subject during the Recess with a view to early legislation.

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON said, he gladly accepted the assurance given, and would consent to withdraw his Motion.

The Sitting was then suspended.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH — ARREST OF MR. MURPHY.—RESOLUTION.

DEBATE RESUMED.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [23rd July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" and which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the right of free speech is one of the most important safeguards of good Government, and that attacks upon this right are, therefore, dangerous to the welfare of the State:—That the recent conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in preventing free discussion of important topics was, in fact, an attack upon this great safeguard of freedom; and is, therefore, deserving of reprehension by this House:—That this conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department has proved especially mischievous, since it has led to breaches of the law on the part of official persons, more particularly by the Mayor of Birmingham, who caused the arrest of an innocent person for the purpose of preventing what to him was distasteful discussion,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. DOWNING said, he adopted every word that had fallen from the noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Viscount Sandon) on this subject. He was one of those who would be sorry to see the right of public meeting encroached upon; but if the House considered the nature of the placards produced that day by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the feelings with which they must have been read by the Roman Catholic population, it must be apparent that they were eminently calculated to lead to a breach of the peace. There was no part of their doctrine to which Roman Catholics were more sincerely attached than to that of the Confessional; and when the character and conduct of the clergy and of ladies were attacked in connection with that subject, it was no wonder that they should be exasperated. He would put it to the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) himself to say how he should like to have doctrines which he believed vital attacked in placards similar to those which had been posted through Birmingham. If the Protestants of the North of Ireland were subjected to such insults they would resent them. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had accused the Catholic clergy of Birmingham of having incited a Catholic mob to attack the lecturer.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I made no such charge.

MR. WHALLEY: I am ready to make that charge.

MR. DOWNING said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would give the names of the Catholic clergy who had done so. If a man took a hall or room he would be perfectly at liberty to lecture on such subjects as he thought proper; but he contended that it was unjustifiable to post those offensive placards through the town. The Secretary of State would have been condemned by every impartial man if he had not taken precautions to prevent scenes of violence and bloodshed which a firebrand like Murphy was likely to provoke.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, that he knew of an instance in which Armagh had been visited by some persons who preached anti-Protestant doctrines, but in no case had they been met by their Protestant hearers in such a way as to cause disturbance. The question involved in this matter was simply whether the British privilege of freedom of meeting and freedom of speech was to be overthrown. The Secretary of State for the Home Department, in dealing with this subject, had prefaced his remarks by some observations on the sacredness of this right to freedom of speech; but as he went on he blamed the maltreated party for their acts, and spoke of them as the authors of the lawless outrages complained of to-night; not a single word of blame did he use as against those who broke into the building, resisting the constituted authorities, and dispersing a meeting assembled in a legitimate manner; he had simply said he did not stand there to defend them. If by faint praise we damn, surely by slight reproof error is condoned. The Secretary of State had described how Murphy, having proposed to give a lecture in a public hall, was proceeding to keep faith with his hearers, when bodies of Irishmen—some of whom had come by train for the purpose—marched, armed in military array, upon the Odd-Fellows Hall, forced the door which the police on duty had barred against them, demolished some portions of the building, and dispersed three-fourths of the meeting. Without entering upon the question of Murphy's character, he asked whether that was not an assault upon the right of public speech and public meeting. As long as Murphy remained within the law he should be protected; if his lectures were marred by indecencies, as had been suggested, he should be prosecuted; if he simply argued, his opponents must be taught to content themselves by meeting him with arguments, and not by throwing brickbats at him. Englishmen loved fair play, and could not understand on what grounds this ruffianly mob could be excused from the consequences of their conduct when they came to the building on purpose to be insulted, and commenced their assault before they could have heard a single word of what was being said withing the building. The junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Muntz) had made rather a remarkable speech upon this matter; he complained that Murphy was a violent agitator, who had forfeited his right as a British subject; but did he know nothing of the career of the senior Member for Birmingham (the President of the Board of Trade?) Was not he an agitator against the law which saved hundreds and thousands of women and children from the tyranny of their employers? Was he not an agitator against the Corn Laws? Surely he was. Had anyone proved that Murphy had violated the law? He was said to have been the cause of riot and of the gutting of houses, but his friends had been the sufferers; and the rioters were not wholly to blame, because they only carried out orders. The Roman Catholics were amiable and Christianlike in private, but they belonged to a magnificent organization, and, when ordered, committed acts of violence. In so doing they were only carrying out a principle the reverse of that which Murphy contended for; they were only carrying out the spirit of a decree by Pope Clement VIII., which declared that liberty of conscience was a curse. How a Protestant Legislature could approve a system organized to crush expression of opinion he could not understand. It was gratuitously assumed that Mr. Murphy had been the cause of riots; but suppose he had been let alone where would the riots have been? He did not make a riot, but those who opposed him. ["Oh! Oh!"] He (Lord Claud Hamilton) invited hon. Gentlemen who interrupted him to adduce a single instance in which Murphy had aided a riot, broken into any person's house, headed a mob, broken people's heads, or used bludgeons and brickbats instead of arguments in discussion. Had not the President of the Board of Trade been in a minority very often, and would he have considered it fair if his arguments had been met by brickbats? If Murphy had been treated as he ought to have been—if the law had not been violated by others, if he had been left free to say what he had to say, the peace of the country would not have been disturbed by him or his friends.

Mr. MUNTZ said, that the remarks he had made had been incorrectly quoted. What he said was that Mr. Murphy was an itinerant agitator, whose course had been always followed by bloodshed and riot, and it was the knowledge of these facts which justified the interference of the Mayor of Birmingham.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it was important to bear in mind a distinction between two questions—whether it was desirable to retain or to repeal an Act of Parliament, and whether it was proper that the Executive should carry out an existing statute. The Secretary of State for the Home Department might have a private opinion that it was scarcely expedient to maintain a statute; but it did not follow he was to take upon himself to say that under no conceivable circumstances should that statute be enforced, for that would be practically to repeal an Act of Parliament. As long as an Act remained on the statute book it was not for the Secretary of State or the Law Officers of the Crown to declare that it should not, under any circumstances, be enforced. The statute in question was spoken of as old and obsolete, and one that had been forgotten; but in the year 1846 it was considered by Parliament, which came to the conclusion that it was desirable to maintain it, with a modification of its provisions. Therefore the Law Officers of the Crown could not assume the responsibility of saying that the statute was one which should not be acted upon. If ever there were any circumstances in which it was proper to put the Act in force they occurred in the case of Murphy. It was not asserted that he was a housebreaker, or that he went sword in hand, and attacked people; but he went about for the purpose of exciting religious animosity; he used language that was indecent and offensive; and he roused into a violent state of excitement—compared with which that of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Claud Hamilton) was nothing—those whose religion he outraged and whose feelings he purposely set at naught. Murphy was rightly described as a firebrand, for wherever he went there were tumult, excitement, and almost insurrection. He was not proceeded against because he was a Protestant; and if a Roman Catholic or a Presbyterian of a hundred-lecturer power went about the country exciting animosity and ill-will he would have to be dealt with in the same manner. Fortunately, there was but one Murphy; there was no man who came near Murphy; this was entirely an exceptional case; and the questions for the Secretary of State in this case were —Will the peace of the country be seriously endangered by Murphy returning to this town? and how is the peace of the country to be maintained? Two courses were open to the Secretary of State—one was repression, the other prevention. He might have directed that police and soldiers should be in readiness to put down the riot if it occurred; or he might prevent the possibility of a riot by acting under the provisions of this Act and preventing the delivery of the lecture. His right hon. Friend took the latter course, and he contended that it was the right course. Mr. Murphy had been described as a man who was sincerely desirous to promote the cause of Protestantism, and who was independent of any considerations of profit. But this statute only gave the authorities power to interfere where lectures were given for money, and if, therefore, he was animated by such Protestant zeal he might have avoided interference by delivering his lectures gratuitously. Instead of this, the price rose in proportion to the excitement occasioned by the lectures, and the highest price was charged for the kind of excitement which was produced by a visit to Dr. Kahn's museum. The fact seemed to be that if Mr. Murphy loved Protestantism much he loved profit more. The Secretary of State might have resorted to repression and coercion and the use of force, though probably not without serious riot, bloodshed, and plunder. Instead of this he threatened to put the Act into force, and the threat was effectual. If a Roman Catholic or Presbyterian lecturer had gone about exciting tumult of this description, and the Secretary of State had not interfered, in all probability the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) would have moved a Vote of Censure upon him for not putting the provisions of this very Act into execution. The Solicitor General and he took their full share of responsibility for the course that had been adopted here; and that was the wisest course which prevented tumult and bloodshed.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, this question now assumed a most serious aspect. It had nothing to do with Popery or Protestantism, religion or politics. The question was whether a person was entitled to express his own opinion in a public meeting convened by himself without being put down by force of riot or force of law. Now, after listening attentively to every word uttered by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, he had come to the conclusion, not as a Protestant or a Liberal, but as a lawyer, that his right hon. Friend's own statement put him out of court. Who were the parties concerned? On the one side was a man whom he never saw or heard, but who was an English citizen. This man proposed to deliver a lecture, and why should he be sneered at for fixing a low price for admission in order to cover expenses? Did the Attorney General mean to say that this person was outside the protection of the law when he proposed to lecture on such subjects as the Seven Sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, or the practice, doctrines, and principles of Confession? Nobody could deny that herein he was exercising the rights of an English citizen, and had a right to claim the whole force of law for his protection against violence. Nobody need go to his lectures who disapproved them; but at North Shields there was an attempt, not by a sudden, but by a concerted riot, to prevent him from delivering them. People came from a distance, across a ferry, with that deliberate object. Well, were they within the law? Of course they were breaking it. As each one joined the others for the purpose of taking a journey to create a tumult, every word they uttered and every step they took in furtherance of their object was a breach of the law. They were guilty of conspiracy to make a riot, and all the force of the law might be fairly invoked by any English citizen against whom they thus put themselves in array. Now, he agreed with the noble Lord opposite (Lord Claud Hamilton) that in the speech of the Secretary of State all the language of extenuation and excuse was for the rioters, while all the language of rebuke and reprimand was for the innocent man; and he defied any man to draw from the argument of the Secretary of State any other conclusion than that the privilege of free speech depended entirely upon the fact of how many people disagreed with you. The position of his right hon. Friend and the Attorney General seemed to be pretty nearly this—"If the people who disagree with you are numerous enough and strong enough and unscrupulous enough, wherever you go, to combine together for the purpose of putting you down, there is an end to free speech and the exercise of the rights of a British citizen. You are not to reckon upon the absolute omnipotence of the law to protect you in the exercise of those rights; but your freedom of speech will depend upon the strength, for the time being, of the party who is opposed to you in opinion." Now, it might be true, though it was not to his knowledge, that Murphy might be personally unworthy of this discussion in the House of Commons, and of any interference in his behalf. But how many great constitutional questions had been fought in the person of an unworthy representative? It was, therefore, nothing to him how far Murphy might be guilty of bad taste and extravagance of language, though not a word had been quoted during the debate to prove this extravagance. It was said that he should never have lectured on these subjects at all. That is, our religious liberty was to be measured by that of a Church which had always denied such liberty. With the Home Office, however, the question appeared to be not who was in the right, but which side would be the easiest to put down. The Secretary of State came to the conclusion that it would be the easiest to put a gag upon this man's mouth. True, it was not legal to do so. [The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is legal.] Well, the Act of 1799 was entitled—"An Act for the more effectual suppression of societies established for seditious and treasonable purposes, and for better preventing treasonable and seditious practices." He asked any candid man whether an Act of Parliament passed for such a purpose as that could, except in some technical sense, be used for the purpose of preventing a man from lecturing upon a religious subject? He maintained that a man so lecturing was entitled to call upon the whole authority of the State to protect him, no matter how much force might be required for that purpose. It was the weakness of the Executive that gave strength to mobs, and the persons who had engaged in those riotous assaults upon individuals and private property had reason to thank the Home Office and rejoice in their success. Murphy was within the law and the law ought to have protected him. The rioters were without the law and the law ought to have put them down. The man who ought to have been protected was put down, and the persons who ought to have been put down were protected. These were his opinions; but as his right hon. Friend had acted with the best intentions and under the advice of the Law Officers, he would not join in censuring him, and therefore he could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire.

MR. T. E. SMITH said, that Murphy came to Tynemouth and delivered lectures which were exceedingly insulting to a large number of the inhabitants. The result was a riot. Murphy left the town, but returned again, and the Mayor thought it his duty to apply to the Home Secretary, and, under the authority of an Act which was not obsolete, the right hon. Gentleman put a stop to Murphy's lectures in Tynemouth. That act of the Home Secretary had the approbation of the whole of the orderly and well-disposed inhabitants, whatever religious denomination they belonged to. Had Mr. Murphy confined himself to vindicating the doctrines of Protestantism his lectures would have been popular in Tynemouth; but he had insulted the Roman Catholics in a gross and aggravating manner.

MR. HOLT said, that in this case there was a great question of principle altogether apart from that of the doctrines preached by Mr. Murphy. It was, however, necessary to mention Mr. Murphy's name, because he was the victim of an act of tyranny. He had supposed that every man in this country was entitled to deliver his opinions without interference so long as he kept himself within the bounds of the law. If Mr. Murphy had said anything illegal the House of Commons ought to be told what it was. It might be that Mr. Murphy was unpopular with a class, but if the liberty of an Englishman were to depend on his popularity, we might say farewell to liberty. In former days, as they had been reminded, minorities had held opinions which subsequently came to be the opinions of the whole country; but, if these opinions had been put down by a strong hand, they would not have occupied the position which they now held. Suppose a Roman Catholic lecturer had been treated as Mr. Murphy was, there would have been half-a-dozen Gentlemen opposite ready to take up the case. There would have been a burst of indignation from every Gentleman immediately opposite had a Conservative Government attempted to stop a lecturer by means similar to those employed by the present Home Secretary, and they would have been told that Tory tyranny had been put into operation to check discussion. He asked what would be said by the Liberal party in that House if at a Tory meeting in Tynemouth or Birmingham a Tory Mayor caused a Liberal gentleman to be arrested for moving an amendment to a Tory motion? It appeared from a report in the *Birmingham Daily Gazette* that at the meeting in that town Dr. Sebastian Evans endeavoured to make his way to the chairman with the object of protesting against a motion being put before an amendment to it was seconded, and that the only answer the Mayor made to his protest was to order him into custody. As he understood the Secretary of State for the Home Department, a large number of Irishmen in Tynemouth said they would kill Mr. Murphy; but instead of these Irishmen being arrested, Mr. Murphy was prevented from delivering his lecture. The persons who committed an illegal act were protected, and the innocent man was punished. If this were to be the rule of conduct for future Home Secretaries, a man might be imprisoned because somebody else had threatened to murder him, and he did not know that a Secretary of State might not justify himself in committing a judicial murder by the plea that it was done in order to prevent bloodshed on a larger scale. If a man were to be locked up because a mob of Irishmen chose to break his windows, he should like to ask the Home Secretary whether, on the occasion of the late election, when his political opponents in North-east Lancashire broke the windows of the building in which he was addressing his constituents, the right hon. Gentleman would have felt justified in preventing him from proceeding by locking him up, or by other methods of coercion? Certainly his party had not charged for admission, but surely a man's liberty ought not to depend upon 2*d*. The question was whether every Englishmen had not a right in a private room to deliver his opinion in such language as he thought fitting to the occasion. The right hon. Gentleman had complained of the strong language that Mr. Murphy had used, but he thought that such a complaint came with a bad grace from the opposite Benches, on which sat hon. and right hon. Members who were in the habit occasionally of expressing their opinions out-of-doors in rather strong language. It was not because a man had used strong language that he was to be put outside the pale of the law. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was known that Mr. Murphy was about to give a mere repetition of his former lectures; but the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten to show that there was anything illegal in those lectures, or anything which justified the course which was adopted. The Act under which Mr. Murphy was arrested was intended to be applied to cases of seditious language, and not to religious lectures. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Muntz) had told the House that Murphy was known as an itinerant agitator, whose course was marked with bloodshed and riot. He did not stand up as the defender of Mr. Murphy; he was unable to say whether the course adopted by him was a wise or an unwise one; but he thought that the hon. Member should have been prepared to show that bloodshed and riot took place at the instigation of Mr. Murphy. What had been the effect of the course taken by the Government in this matter? Why, the mob had already begun to take advantage of it. At a place called Patricroft a mob of Irishmen assaulted some Methodist preachers who were about to preach, and drove them away with the cry—"You're not going to do as you like any longer; we'll have things different. . . We'll let you that we are under a Liberal Government now." Bible teachers in Ireland were generally pelted—and that, in the belief that such conduct would be upheld by the present Government. That was the conclusion that the masses had drawn from the action of Her Majesty's Government, and such an opinion was not likely to be conducive to either personal liberty or to liberty of speech. It was to that House that the people looked for the defence of their liberties. During the Session hon. Members on opposite Benches had been kept apart by a subject on which they had taken different views, but upon this subject they might join hands and unite, not for the purpose of defending any particular man, or any peculiar theological principle, but for the purpose of defending the principle of personal freedom and of free discussion—a principle in which all, whether Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen, Churchmen, or Nonconformists, were equally interested.

MR. HENLEY said, that they must all agree with the first part of the Motion, which merely propounded the truism that free speech was one of the most important safeguards of good government; but the next part of the Motion went on to propose a Vote of Censure upon the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Now, it was always a very grave matter to propose a Vote of Censure in that House upon anybody, and the greatest caution should be observed in bringing such a proposition forward. The last part of the Motion applied to the conduct of the Mayor of Birmingham and others. Upon the latter point he should merely observe that if the Mayor of Birmingham and others had done anything contrary to the law they would be amenable to the law, and might be made to pay for it without the matter being brought before that House upon an *ex parte* statement. It would be very unjust for the House to pronounce an opinion on a matter which was or might be *sub judice.* He then came to the really important question of what had been called an attack upon the freedom of discussion. No one was more jealous than he was of the interference of arbitrary power in any form, whether that of a Secretary of State or a policeman; but he could not help feeling that the freedom of discussion might be injured as much by being abused as by being arbitrarily interfered with. Abuse of that freedom had led to such enactments as that under which the Secretary of State had acted. It had been alleged against the Secretary of State for the Home Department that, being a party to the repeal of this Act, he had on the eve of its repeal put it into force for the purpose of oppressing Mr. Murphy. The right hon. Gentleman himself had pointed out how little it mattered whether an Act of Parliament were moribund or not. As long as it was in existence he had a right to put it into force. He questioned whether the Act of Parliament under which the right hon. Gentleman acted had been repealed by the Newspaper Act. The Act of Parliament which had been referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. T. Chambers), and which was passed in the last year of the last century, was applicable solely to matters of sedition and of the public peace. But there was another Act, 57 *Geo.* III., passed in the time of the Regency, which, following precisely the clauses of the former Act, was also applicable to meetings held for immoral purposes. The Act 57 *Geo.* III. was referred to in that of 9 & 10 *Vict.*, which provided that prosecutions could only be conducted by the Law Officers of the Crown. Now, what had the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State said? He had produced a handbill setting forth a great many matters which were of such a nature that there was a notice that women were requested not to attend, and that male persons under eighteen years of age would not be permitted to attend the lectures. Well, it was not a very unfair inference to draw from that that the subject of the lecture must have been somewhat special. What it was the House had not been exactly told, except that it was something relating to the Confessional. At all events, if it were not suitable for women and male persons under eighteen years of age to hear, it was not a violent conclusion to draw that it might have been something which at least was not of a highly moral nature. If his memory was not treacherous, there existed in London not many years ago an anatomical museum into which women and young persons were not admitted, and he believed that somehow or other that establishment came into contact with the law as not being an extremely proper exhibition. This would almost lead him to the conclusion that there was fair ground for considering that the lecture to which he had just referred was not likely to be of a very proper kind. If so, there had been no straining of the law on the part of the Home Secretary. These were the points which had struck him with reference to this matter. Other persons might not, perhaps, have come to the same conclusion as the right hon. Gentleman, but the question for the House now to determine was whether a man honestly acting to the best of his ability for the public service had any fair grounds for putting the Act in force. Under the circumstances, he was unable to join in a Vote of Censure on the Home Secretary. There was a responsibility on that right hon. Gentleman, and he was unable to say that he had not acted to the best of his ability. The right hon. Gentleman had not strained the law, and, therefore, he, for one, could not support a Vote of Censure upon his conduct.

MR. NEWDEGATE rose to address the House, whereupon—

MR. SPEAKER inquired: Does the hon. Member desire to make an explanation?

MR. NEWDEGATE: No; I am going to reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member having moved an Amendment, has no right to reply.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I beg to state— ["Chair!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may ask permission to withdraw his Amendment, but he cannot reply.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I wish to put

a question to you, Sir. It is not my intention to move the last paragraph of the Resolution. What am I to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member having moved the whole, it is in the possession of the House, and he cannot withdraw any part of the Resolution without the permission of the House.

MR. NEWDEGATE: Then I ask the permission of the House to withdraw the last paragraph. ["No!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The House declines to permit it.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I am in the hands of the House. It is not the usual course to take a Resolution out of the hands of an hon. Member. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The Resolution has been moved, and is in the possession of House, and it is for the House to decide whether it will permit the whole or any part of it to be withdrawn.

COLONEL BARTTELOT: I beg to move that the last paragraph of the Resolution be now omitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The original Question was, that I do now leave the Chair, since which an Amendment has been moved, and it is not competent for the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Barttelot) to rise to make another Motion. That which is before the House must be first disposed of. If it be negatived, then will be the time to move the insertion of words as an Amendment. I must, therefore, put the original Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"

NAVY—NAVAL AND MILITARY CONTRACTS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. MUNTZ said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the manner in which Contracts and purchases have been made by the Naval and Military Departments of the Government, and to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to inform the House of the nature of the changes in this respect recently introduced at the Admiralty. The constituencies had a right to look for a considerable reduction of expenditure, without which there could be no great reduction of taxation, and no Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, could expect to retain the confidence of the people, which did not address itself earnestly to the task of economical reform. It would therefore be necessary to trace the growth of Imperial and local taxation, and also of naval and military expenditure, between the year 1835 and the present time. In 1835, our Imperial taxation amounted to £44,422,000, and our local taxation to about £11,000,000. At the end of last year, our Imperial taxation had increased to £70,000,000, and our local taxation to £20,000,000. If our Imperial taxation went on increasing as it had done of late years, by the year 1900 it would reach £144,000,000 per annum. It was mainly to the cost of the Army and Navy that we must look for the means of effecting any important saving. The expenditure for those services amounted in 1835 to £11,720,000, whereas, last year, including the supplementary credit and various odds and ends, it reached to about £30,000,000 per annum. The hon. Member next compared the cost of our Army with that of Continental nations, and showed that the soldiers of countries, in every respect our equals, cost a far less sum per man. He did not wish to reduce the number of men in the Army or Navy, but he asked how it was that each soldier of our Army cost £115, while the cost of the Prussian was considerably lower? and it was an army equal in every respect to our own in discipline and efficiency. He was sorry to say there was an immense system of nepotism which pervaded every Department, and which ought no longer to be tolerated. If he had a clerk who did not do his work he would send him away, but under the Government every man, however stupid, had a freehold interest. ["No, no!"] But it really was so; for whenever an attempt was made, as last night, to do away with an useless office, they were immediately told by the Secretary to the Treasury that the holder, if dismissed, would have to receive full pay, because he had a life interest in it. Some fifty years ago, if a boy were very stupid, it would be said—"Oh, put him in the Church." But now that the Church had many pious and educated men as ministers, the best thing that could be done with a stupid lad was to put him in a Government Office. Although, out of regard to a Ministry but recently appointed, the House had not been very pressing, in regard to economy this Session, he begged to say that next year they would not be so easy, and that their constituents would no longer tolerate wasteful and extravagant expenditure. With regard to the question of contracts and purchases, he did not know whether the Army or the Navy was the worst offender. Just as in the case of anchors, which for eighteen years had been purchased from the same man, so he ventured to say that the purchase of almost every other article had been confined to some particular person, and that they might have been obtained, if a business-like plan had been adopted, at far lower rates than they had cost. He begged to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to inform the House of the nature of the changes with regard to the contracts and purchases recently introduced at the Admiralty.

Mr. BAXTER said, he would not follow the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Muntz) over the very extensive ground which he had travelled, but would merely answer the Question which he had put on the Paper. That the House might fully understand the nature of the changes in the making of contracts which had been introduced at the Admiralty, it would be necessary to contrast the past with the present organization of that Department. In the beginning of this year the Admiralty consisted of the Departments of the Secretary, of the Controller of the Navy, of the Storekeeper General, of the Coastguard, of the Accountant General, of the Director of Works, of the Medical Director General, and others, making ten separate and nearly independent departments, having a staff of clerks and writers numbering 459. The House was aware that while a considerable portion of this large clerical staff was employed at Whitehall a very much larger portion was located at Somerset House. The inconvenience — he might almost say, the absurdity—of such an arrangement could scarcely be exaggerated. Anyone who had experience of the number of messages daily and hourly passing between Whitehall and Somerset House must be sensible of the great waste of time and money involved in such a separation. The first thing that was done when the present Government acceded to Office was to resolve that all this clerical staff should be brought as soon as possible under one roof. He was happy to inform the House that a very considerable portion of the staff at Somerset House had been brought to Whitehall, and in a short time that great transfer he hoped would be fully accomplished. His right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty had, at an early period of the Session, informed the House of the nature of the changes which, with great wisdom and foresight, he had made in the constitution and working of the Board of Admiralty itself. These changes needed no defence from him, for he ventured to say that no one conversant with their practical operation for the last few months would impugn their success. Then they were called to consider a reform in the purchase system. The system which formerly existed was, he would venture to say, totally opposed to all sound commercial principles; it was one over which neither the Board of Admiralty itself nor that House exercised any efficient control. What was that system? The Storekeeper General located in Somerset House and his clerks bought all the goods he thought necessary for the dockyards. The Controller of the Victualling Department did the same thing for the fleet, and so on. But it unfortunately happened that not one of the heads of these departments, however great their professional abilities might be, had any commercial knowledge whatever. His right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, therefore resolved to take from the different departments all matters connected with with purchase, and to establish a purchase department, presided over by a man of business, supported by clerks chosen entirely for their business knowledge, who should be responsible primarily for all purchases. He said primarily because it was thought desirable that the Lords of the Admiralty whose departments required certain articles should have a voice in the manner in which these articles were procured. All the alterations had not been completed, but already, instead of 459 clerks and writers—the number on the 1st of January—there would not be more than about 339 employed by the end of the year. The saving would be about £30,000. This morning the Controller of the Navy Sir Spencer Robinson, who had rendered able assistance in the work of economy, had given him a paper showing that instead of forty-three clerks and writers employed in the material and construction department of the Admiralty, at a cost of more than £11,000, by the present arrangement twenty-two clerks and writers of all ranks would serve every purpose at a cost of £5,405. He had come to the conclusion that the Admiralty in its civil branches had been greatly overmanned, a defect which naturally led to an increase of unnecessary work; for although many of the Admiralty clerks did as fair a day's work as the clerks in any establishment, others were simply ornamental under the old system, and their departure from the service would be highly beneficial to it. He would next give a few particulars as to the savings that had already been effected in the purchase department. The whole amount of the Store and Victualling Votes taken in the last year's Navy Estimates amounted to £1,708,000. A great part of this amount was made up of standing contracts, which, of course, could not be terminated at once, and most of them had a considerable time to run; but the saving on new purchases, as far as actual price was concerned, was at present on an average 13 per cent; so that if we had been able to deal with the whole contracts this year, £231,000 would have been the saving. One article of large consumption he found cost last year £73 10*s.* a ton; he had made several purchases of what he was told on all hands was superior in quality to former purchases, at an average of £43. [Several hon. MEMBERS: What is it?] He did not deem it prudent to mention the article, on the ground that publicity might lead to correspondence in the newspapers; he would, however, be happy to place the paper containing the information desired in the hand of any hon. Member. In marking cordage, which he would mention, as it was a small matter, he had made a saving of £1,800 by using jute instead of worsted; and the officers told him the jute answered better. The saving on a small-coal contract for the Mauritius was no less than £1,500 a year; and in coal they had already saved up to June £12,000. His predecessor in Office (Lord Henry Lennox) had a question on the Paper as to whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to discontinue the use of smokeless coal. He could assure him there was no such intention, but that the Admiralty as at present advised, intended to use a mixture of North Country and South Wales coal, which was almost smokeless, and was much approved by scientific men. He should be much surprised if that did not save £30,000 a year. He was quite satisfied that the expenditure on coal this year would not exceed £140,000, as against £345,000 for the year 1867-8, made up of £225,000 for what was bought at home, and £120,000 for the purchases abroad; and the coal would be better in quality into the bargain. They had issued circulars to all the admirals abroad, calling attention to the wasteful expenditure of coal at the different stations. Then, in reference to the articles purchased for the use of officers and men on board our ships, a similar supervision had resulted in a similar saving. An article of great consumption bought for 9*d.* per pound in former years was now bought at 6½*d.*, the quality being superior at the lower price in the estimation of the examining officers. On another article he had effected a saving of 38½ per cent. Another article bought last year at 1*s.* 7½*d.* was this year bought at 1*s.* 5*d.*; and in the case of other articles the reductions made were from 9*s.* 1½*d.* per bushel to 6*s.* 4¾*d.*, and from 8*s.* 4*d.* per bushel to 6*s.* 4*d.* In the case of another article the price which had been paid was £22 15*s.* a ton, and the price this year was £16 3*s.* a ton. Let it not be thought that in making these purchases he had been actuated entirely by a desire to get goods as cheaply as possible. On the contrary, his desire had been to get the best that were in the market, and in one particular instance he directed the payment of an advance of from 20 to 25 per cent in the price of an article which a contractor had supplied for many years at low prices, but of an extremely inferior quality. He was sorry to say this was not all. He found on entering Office that the Admiralty was doing business with a great many firms that were simply not respectable. One of the first things he did was to close the accounts of all those firms; and now a register was very carefully kept of the results of inquiries in regard to the means and the respectability of every firm proposing to do business with the Admiralty. It would not be prudent to state, in detail, all the irregularities, not to say corruption, that had prevailed in connection with the making of contracts; far less would it do for him to tell the House the precise manner in which these transactions had been managed. At the same time he would not mince matters; he would call spades spades; and he would say at once that a system of what was called "tipping" had prevailed both at Somerset House and at the dockyards — a system which it had been and should be his endeavour to uproot. They all knew that the system was not confined to the Admiralty, nor even to the Government Departments, but it prevailed extensively in railway and other large public companies; and it was high time, if England wished to retain her commercial honour, that an effort should be made to put an end to it. It did not require the Rumble-Gambier trial, the annotations found in the note books of those now in gaol, the subsequent discoveries of detectives, or the representations made to him by firms of the highest respectability in the City of London to convince him that for many years past money had been given in order to obtain contracts and also to pass goods at the dockyards. It had been directed that all contracts should for the future be made by an officer directly responsible to the House of Commons, and a circular was issued stating that when a contractor felt himself aggrieved by the rejection of his goods he had only to write to the Financial Secretary of the Admiralty, who would appoint an arbitrator to investigate the whole transaction. He had not thought it prudent to adopt any particular mode of purchase. Sometimes purchases were made by advertisement, sometimes by tender, sometimes by direct offer, and sometimes by an agent or broker, that course being adopted which at the time seemed to be the best. It was not always prudent, without respect to times and seasons, to advertise the wants of the Government in the newspapers; the result sometimes was to encourage combination and to send up the market price, for as soon as the Government was known to be in the market prices went up immediately. He found that a number of galling and harassing conditions had been imposed upon contractors, such as heavy bonds and stamped contracts for the most trifling transactions. The other day a case came before him in which the value of the stamp was greater than the amount of the transaction. Such things had been going on from time immemorial, and he was trying to put an end to them. An examination of patterns showed that 60 or 70 per cent of them were obsolete, and that fact alone had restricted the supply to certain antiquated sources. Speaking generally, he had endeavoured to conduct the business of purchasing for the Admiralty precisely as he conducted his own business; and he had received great assistance from friends, both in and out of the House, and particularly from junior officers of the Navy, who came forward to expose the faults of the prevailing system. The result had been to show that the business of a great Government Department, as far as purchasing was concerned, might be conducted on very nearly as advantageous terms as the business of a private firm. In the discussion on the Navy Estimates, horror was expressed at the idea of our having introduced copying presses. He had since made another innovation, which was to subscribe to business papers and prices current, so that the officials might know the value of things in the market. Much remained to be done in the judicious disposal of old stores, of timber, copper, and various kinds of iron, the quantities of which lying out were beyond all conception. The other day there came to him from one of the dockyards a demand for an enormous quantity of birch brooms, and that suggested an inquiryas to the cost of cleaning the dockyards, which proved to have been £23,000 a year. Economy, he believed, had only just begun. Without striking off a single sailor on a single ship, without impairing the efficiency of the Navy even in the event of war, there was great room for enormous reductions in these over-grown establishments. With the questions of the amount of naval force to be kept up and of the disposition of the fleet he had nothing to do. His had been the humbler task of assisting his right hon. Friend the First Lord in attempting to show the people of this country that if they still desired to retain a Navy far superior to that of any other Power—and certainly they had that at the present moment—they could do it at a much reduced cost.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he regretted that in the absence of the right hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Corry), and of the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox), the task of saying a few words on the subject of the reply they had just heard had fallen to him. He could not but feel that the mode in which the hon. Gentleman had spoken of the reforms he had introduced rather reflected upon his right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry) and his predecessors in Office. The object, he believed, of every Administration had been, as far as lay in their power, to endeavour to effect an economical administration of the public service, combined with due efficiency; and if there were any reflection at all it fell much more upon the Administration of which the present First Lord had been a member for five or six years, during Lord Palmerston's Government, than upon the Administration which held Office for two years from 1866 to 1868. The system of public contracts had this advantage, that no member of the Board of Admiralty had ever been charged with complicity with those to whom public contracts were given. He did not for one moment intend to throw any blame upon the present Board of Admiralty for the system they had inaugurated, but they had yet to show that the system was successful. He knew that as long as his right hon. Friend the present First Lord of the Admiralty and the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had the conduct of the affairs of that Department the public honour was safe in their hands; but, he confessed, that where there would be pressure in time of war, and where enormous purchases were entrusted to one individual, there would be more risk to the public, through that individual being tampered with, than there was in the system of public contracts. Indeed, he believed that where large and considerable transactions were involved, the system of public contracts was likely to be more advantageous and more economical than any system of private purchase. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty had stated that by going into the market and entrusting the purchase to a private individual he had succeeded in purchasing what was required at a less cost, and in securing an article of a better quality; and when his hon. Friend made that statement on his official responsibility, he was perfectly willing to accept it. But three or four months' experience was not sufficient to prove the efficiency of the system, and he believed that the system of contract had hitherto been fairly, openly, and advantageously conducted by those to whom it had been entrusted. With reference to the coal purchases, as he understood the matter, certain additional orders had been sent to officers on foreign stations, desiring them to exercise economy in the consumption of fuel. But the orders had always been very stringent on that point, and officers, if they neglected to pay attention to them, were liable to reprimand and punishment. He thought it would, perhaps, be well to wait until the Estimates for next year were produced, until they decided whether any reduction had been made in the consumption of fuel, and whether any advantage had accrued to the public service through the change. It had been asserted that the smoky and bituminous coal was more advantageous to the public service than the smokeless fuel which had been introduced into the Navy. That might be so, but the reports from the coast of Africa and the China station, the two stations where it was necessary to maintain our ships at war efficiency, showed that with the former the service was ill-performed, and that the smoke of the steamers betrayed their position; and, if that was so, of course the difference of 2*s.* per ton was a matter not worthy of consideration for a moment. He was, therefore, very sorry to find the First Lord of the Admiralty and his hon. Friend reversing the arrangement which had been made by the late Board. It was not possible for him to offer much criticism upon the statement made by his hon. Friend the Secretary of the Admiralty with regard to articles unnamed and unknown, and with regard to market conditions about which his hon. Friend had thought it right to be reticent. He was by no means disposed to criticize unfavourably many of the changes made at the Admiralty; but he could not help thinking that the reflections which had been thrown upon the hon. Gentleman's predecessors at the head of the Admiralty, and the mode in which the changes had on that occasion been announced to the House, were unworthy the character of the hon. Gentleman by whom that statement had been made.

MR. CANDLISH said, he thought the House was indebted to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Admiralty for the clear statement he had made; and he (Mr. Candlish) felt personally grateful to his hon. Friend for the firm and courageous action which he had inaugurated at the Board of Admiralty in connection with the right hon. Gentleman who presided over that Department. He did not understand that his hon. Friend had thrown reflections upon any of his predecessors at the Board. The evils which he denounced were the growth of years, and had become inherent in the system. In a Committee upstairs he was surprised to learn from an officer of the Navy that he did not think it necessary to inquire into the market price of articles at all, but that he trusted entirely to public tenders. He was glad to find from the admirable statement of his hon. Friend that the new system had resulted in so great economy, and he hoped the Secretary of State for War would be able to tell an equally flattering tale as to the Army. He wished to know whether the clerks that were to be superseded were to be allowed a freehold in their services. The country was now spending £4,000,000 a year on non-effective services, or something like 15 or 20 per cent of the whole sum devoted to the maintenance of the Army and Navy; and this would be increased if the unnecessary clerks were to receive life pensions. He wished to ask whether anything had been done to effect a reduction in the number of non-effectives?

Mr. LIDDELL said, he thought it but right to congratulate any Administration that was able to make such a statement as that which he had heard that evening from the hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Admiralty. He believed, however, that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry), whose absence that evening was a source of regret to them all, would, had he remained at the Admiralty, have carried out many advantageous alterations, as his right hon. Friend was fully alive to the importance and necessity of introducing reforms. Ever since he had heard the speech of the present first Lord of the Admiralty he had felt that a new system was about to be initiated in the Department. He placed great confidence in his right hon. Friend, and might be permitted to observe that he had with great firmness and vigour carried out a system of reform, which perhaps was partly due to the inquiries of the Select Committee of last year. The members of that Committee were not able to lay their hands distinctly upon any portion of any particular Department in which those reforms could be specified, but they one and all became in the course of that inquiry thoroughly convinced that there was much to be done in the way of reform. He was exceedingly glad to hear that the system of purchase was undergoing an alteration; for, though he agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend that if a spirit of competition existed a system of contracts might be very well, this system depended on the way in which they took their contracts. They had at the Admiralty a contract list, and it was against it the manufacturers and producers of the country had set their faces, because while it existed there was no fair criterion. He was glad the contract list had been abolished, and he hoped it had been abolished for ever.

Mr. RATHBONE said, the country had long been indignant at the mode of management pursued by the Admiralty in respect to contracts. He hoped the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty would be supported by the House in his efforts to reform abuses.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, he thought the House and the country had reason to feel grateful for the able statement laid before them that night. It was hardly fair on the part of the hon Baronet opposite (Sir John Hay) to say that the remarks of the Secretary to the Admiralty implied a censure on his predecessor, at the Admiralty. The real reason why the business of the Admiralty had been better conducted under the present Government was that that Department, or at least the financial part of it, was in the hands of a man of business. No doubt the heads of the War and other Departments were anxious to conduct the service in an economical manner, but so long as they were at the mercy of subordinates so long would the country have to complain of wasteful and extravagant expenditure. It was notorious to business men that both at the Admiralty and in the War Department, especially the latter, there was a systematic corruption in respect of contracts, and the result had been that the most respectable houses would not accept a Government contract. During the Crimean War the worst articles were purchased at the highest prices. He himself had brought under the notice of Lord Northbrook, when he was Mr. Baring, a case in which a quantity of underclothing had been purchased for the troops under these circumstances. The articles were made at Nottingham and sold to a Dublin commission agent in Dublin, who sold them to an army clothier in that city, by whom they were sold to the War Department at 40 per cent over the original price. Again, he had been asked to inspect a quantity of cotton socks for the army. He found that the pattern had been sealed in 1823; and that for twenty years there had been no machinery at work which could make socks such as the sealed pattern. The goods furnished were no more like the sealed pattern than he was like Hercules. Another great source of waste were the manufacturing departments of the Government. We had gunpowder enough to last us for ten years, if not twice as long, and nearly 70,000,000 cartridges, which were in rapid process of deterioration. He believed that, if pains were taken to investigate the matter, it would be found that we had in store stocks of articles sufficient for five years, though tenders were taken for those articles year after year. During the preparations for the war in Abyssinia coals were required in the Thames. A contractor with whom a contract was made at the time of the Crimean War claimed his right to supply 10,000 tons. Was it not ridiculous to make a coal contract for so long a period as five years? Every one knew that coals had fallen 25 or 30 per cent within the last few years. He could have no hope of a complete reform in contracts for the Army as long as the War Department was under two separate roofs. The dual system was a mysterious and complicated device for showing "how not to do it."

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he could not congratulate the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty either on the prudence of his financial statements, or the taste which had characterized the remarks in which he alluded to his predecessors. The thanks of the House were eminently due to the right hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Corry), whose cumulative knowledge and general administration exceeded that possessed by hon. Gentlemen opposite. There were only two contracts in the Navy which could be regarded as close contracts, and those were for anchors and for steam-engines. All the other articles in use in the Navy had been bought by open contract. The anchors had been bought from Messrs. Brown, Lennox and Co., ever since he went to sea, forty-five years ago, and from that time to the present no ship had ever gone on shore from the fault of the anchor, nor had any vessel parted from her chains where it was at all possible to hold on. In the Crimea the superiority of their anchors and cables enabled Her Majesty's ships to ride out the storms in safety, while the unfortunate transports, supplied with rotten cables by the much-vaunted men of business, were running ashore and being knocked to pieces. This showed that those who had gone before the right hon. Gentleman who now administered the Navy were not such fools as he appeared to think they were. The hon. Member had taken credit for the reductions in the prices of the contracts; but was not hemp 13 per cent cheaper during the present year than it was last, and were not beef and peas also a great deal cheaper, while flour alone was a little dearer? Then they had been told that the firms with which the late Admiralty had dealt were not respectable; whether they were or not, it was not for him to decide; but all he could say was that as a Dockyard Member he should institute a pretty strict inquiry as to the existence of "tipping," to which allusion had been made. With regard to the birch brooms, the hon. Member, being a new broom himself, was naturally a little jealous of them, but surely he could not complain of an annual charge of £20,000 for keeping seven dockyards clean. The First Lord of the Admiralty had so diminished the number of vessels that the condition of the Navy was reduced below what he had ever known it to be before, except when, in Sir James Graham's time, there was only one ship to represent the Channel Fleet. If any complication were to take place now the whole concern would fall on the head of the First Lord of the Admiralty like a house of cards. With regard to the subject of these purchases, he might say that he had a great jealousy of mercantile men. There were scarcely ten firms in existence now that were in being forty-five years since; and in no case had Government officers been guilty of the misconduct that clerks in merchants' offices had been guilty of. Of all persons in the world to attack Government officers mercantile men should be the last. This might be plain speaking, but he was sent to that House to speak the truth, and he would take care to do so. As to coal, he disliked the mixture which had been spoken of, and would prefer to have either a really good smoky coal, or one that did not smoke at all. But if they were to continue to carry on warlike operations with the secresy of movement which was often necessary, and if they did not wish to have the sailors' clothes and the ships' rigging destroyed by the smoke, they would have the smokeless coal. In conclusion, he expressed his satisfaction with the fact that the Abyssinian War Committee would soon be compelled to stop its labours, and he hoped that Parliament would never again see anything of the kind instituted.

Mr. CHILDERS said, his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty had spoken very clearly as to the arrangements which had been made in connection with the purchase of stores; but he had not claimed, as he might have done, credit for them as having been entirely worked out by him. The general principle had been stated to the House in opening the Estimates, but the whole of the very difficult details had been worked out by his hon. Friend. One or two questions of some little importance had been raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay). His hon. Friend's observations with regard to the subject of coal arose, he believed, from his not having quite appreciated the answer which he (Mr. Childers) had given at the commencement of the Session, when he was asked what change had been made in reference to the purchase of coal. It was quite true that the late Board of Admiralty, upon a report furnished from the West Coast of Africa, had decided upon altering the system which had been in practice, but he thought it scarcely right because of a report in favour of smokeless coal from one station that none but Welsh coal should be used in the Navy. He would like now to refer to the remarks made by his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), and he could assure his hon. Friend that they were doing all in their power to ascertain the quantity of obsolete stock, and also to regulate more economically their supplies in all parts of the world. His hon. Friend the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish), in refering to the non-effective services, had asked him whether, while cutting off from the top, they had at the same time put a stop to the supplies at the bottom. In answer to that question, he might state that, with one exception, he had not made a single civil appointment since he came into Office, that he did not intend to make any, and that he believed that none would be necessary for years to come. In regard, too, to the number of officers having the right to superannuation and compensation on their offices being abolished—what was commonly called "the establishment"—this class would be reduced by the appointment of a class at present known under the name of "writers." The House, too, might have observed that within the last few days a Pensions Commutation Bill had been passing through its different stages. That Bill had passed both Houses almost *sub silentio;* but under its provisions they would be enabled to reduce the non-effective list, and also the list of officers on half-pay. Although its operation would be gradual, and they would have to take care that justice was done to all concerned, they had every reason to believe that it would lead to a great reduction in our offices and establishments. His hon. Friend who had last spoken had said that he had so reduced the Navy that the whole concern would give way on the first occasion. It was very easy to make such a statement, but he ventured to anticipate a very different result. When he brought forward the Estimates this year he stated that he had not reduced the Navy by a single blue jacket. So far from our Navy being less efficient, he was able to say that it never was stronger, whether at sea, or in our home ports; and he would point to the power of calling out the Reserve fleet, the despatch of the flying squadron, and the condition of the Channel and Mediteranean Fleets in evidence of this.

Mr. CARDWELL desired to say a few words in consequence of what had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), who had made a very serious charge in reference to Army purchases—such a charge as ought never to be lightly made. His hon. Friend might remember that after the Crimean War Lord Panmure introduced a new system of purchase into the Army. Under that plan, as was now being done by his right hon. Friend and his hon. Friend in the case of the Navy, the Department by which the purchase was made and the Department by which the article was consumed were held entirely distinct. Inspection, again, was independent of the reception of the article, and the vouchers in each case made out by distinct officers, met together in the hands of the auditors, and were subjected to examination before payment was made. He could not suppose that there was anything in the Department with which he had the honour to be connected that could be regarded as winking at a fraud or anything of that nature, but if any hon. Friend of his would bring to his knowledge any fact pointing in ever so small a degree in the direction of "tipping" he would promise that no vigilance should be wanting on his part to thoroughly investigate the matter. He ought to say that the plan established by Lord Panmure, which was conducted at that time under the immediate direction of Sir Benjamin Hawes, was, like that in the Navy, chiefly, though not exclusively, carried on by tender. They endeavoured, as far as possible, to follow the plan adopted by large commercial firms—to buy in the market by private purchase where that plan was the more advantageous, and to purchase by tender where such a plan would be adopted by large commercial houses. [MR. MUNDELLA: A close list.] It was undoubtedly a close list to a certain extent; but any person who desired to be placed on the list had only to communicate with the Department and to produce satisfactory references of his respectability to enable him to get his name placed upon the list. He had understood his right hon. Friend the Financial Secretary of the Admiralty to say that he had found that the Admiralty had been in the habit occasionally of contracting with firms that were not respectable, and this plan had been adopted to prevent the continuance of that practice. When he came into Office he found that the control system had been established, a system which, though it dated back as far as Lord De Grey and Lord Herbert, owed its immediate introduction to the action of his right hon. Friend the Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington). Under that system a thorough examination was now being instituted into all departments of the service. If they found that the system, which had been in force during the last fourteen or fifteen years, could be improved they were anxious and desirous of adopting improvements. With regard to retrenchment, he had no desire to take exclusive credit to himself for the reduction that had been made, but he might observe that the Store Vote was now less by one-third than it was in the previous year, and a reduction was going on in the various administrative departments of the Army. He had made these remarks for the purpose of doing justice to the Department over which he had the honour to preside, and for the purpose of explaining to the House what had been done by his predecessors. It was his intention earnestly and steadily to promote to the utmost of his power that system of economy of which he had spoken, and with respect to the non-effective Votes, all he could say was that, like his right hon. Friend at the head of the Admiralty, he had not made a civil appointment since he came into Office, and he thought the day was distant when he should do so. He entirely approved the system of diminishing permanent appointments as far as possible, and nothing would give him more satisfaction than to select for mere mechanical duties men who had served their country in the Army in earlier life.

MR. HENLEY wished to say a single word upon the subject of private purchase or contract. He would not offer any opinion upon the general question; but his belief was that if any Government made large private purchases they would become as unpopular as could be desired; for the most unfounded allegations would be made against them.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 26*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) * (226); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment * (227).

Second Reading — Evidence Amendment (110).

Committee — Bankruptcy (208); Imprisonment for Debt (168-224); Prevention of Gaming (Scotland) * (206-225).

Committee—Report—Debts of Deceased Persons * (169).

Report—Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* (205).

Third Reading—Endowed Schools * (220); Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland) * (180); Fines and Fees Collection * (155); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (183), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Irish Church [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 42]; Pensions Commutation [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 32]; Judicial Statistics (Scotland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 33]; Stipendiary Magistrates (Deputies) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 34]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act (1860) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 35]; Court of Session Act (1868) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 36]; Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 37]; Special Bails [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 38]; Sunday and Ragged Schools [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 40]; Assessed Rates [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 41]; Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 39]; Poor Law Board Provisional Orders Confirmation [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 123]; Local Government Supplemental [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 124].

PURCHASES FOR THE NATIONAL GALLERY—THE "REMBRANDT."

QUESTION.

Lord DE L'ISLE and DUDLEY asked the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies (Earl Granville), Upon whose judgment and responsibility a picture in the National Gallery representing "Christ Blessing Little Children," ascribed to Rembrandt, but by many persons supposed to be a spurious work of little or no value, was purchased at the price of £7,000? The picture, he believed, was originally in the Schönborn Collection at Vienna; from thence it passed into the hands of a foreign gentleman of whom, in 1866, it was purchased for the National Gallery. In the following year a noble Lord stated in "another place" that according to one of the first auctioneers of the day, it would, if put up to sale, fetch literally nothing. That opinion had since been confirmed by many authorities, and, as far as he knew, no contradiction had been given. He was aware that great difference must always exist as to the value of the genuineness of many pictures, and it might appear presumptuous in him to offer any opinion in this case; but he felt bound to say that, in his judgment, even if it could be proved to be a Rembrandt, it was a very inferior work, a very costly purchase, and a very repulsive painting. Indeed, the more it was looked at the less could it be liked. He had been informed that a picture very similar to it had recently been put up to auction in St. James's Street, without obtaining a single bid. He might also mention the fact that a few years ago two pictures, one by Van Huysum and the other by Cuyp, were sold for 380 and 382 guineas, and might have been originally purchased for those sums, but were shortly afterwards purchased for the National Gallery for £1,800?

Earl GRANVILLE thought it would be better if this Question and that of a noble Earl opposite, who had given a notice of similar nature, were answered by his noble Friend (Lord Overstone), who, as a Trustee of the National Gallery, would be able to give a full explanation.

The Earl of WINCHELSEA rose to ask for information respecting three pictures which were now or had been in the National Gallery. His first Question was, By whose authority picture 234 "Warrior adoring Infant Jesus," bought by the nation for the sum of £3,000 as a veritable Giorgione, is now called Venetian School, (1,505) and is not included in the official catalogue? He had understood that £3,000 was given for it, but he was informed that this was a mistake. His second Question was, On what grounds a picture (790) sold out of Cardinal Fesch's collection for sixteen florins, less or more, was bought of Mr. Macpherson for the sum of

£2,000, and called after Michael Angelo, which great name it does not appear to have borne previously? Now it was well known that Michael Angelo never painted in oil, but simply furnished designs for his pupils. According to Vasari, he gave Anton Mini—

> "La maggior parte de disegni e cartone fatte da lui, ch'erano cosa divina; cosi due casse di modegli con gran numero di cartoni finiti per far pitture, e parte d'opere fatte."

Many of these were stolen after the death of Mini in France. Mr. Wornum, moreover, had not always been of the same opinion as when he published the catalogue of the National Gallery, for in his *Epochs of Painting* was this passage—

> "As painter Michael Angelo is almost exclusively known for his productions in fresco; he never painted in oil colours, and there is only one tempered picture attributed to him—a Holy Family, now in the gallery at Florence—which has any pretensions to be well authenticated; it is said to have been painted for Angelo Doni; it has, however, every trace of having been painted by Angelo Bronzino, whatever may be the origin of the design."

His third Question was, What became of a certain spurious "Ecce Homo," purporting to be by Correggio, which belonged to the nation previous to the purchase of the real picture from the collection of the late Marquess of Londonderry; when and to whom it was sold, if sold it were, what price it fetched, and whether the proceeds were carried to the national account? He hoped that his Questions would not be regarded as an attack on the Trustees of the National Gallery, for he was sure they discharged their duty with the utmost conscientiousness; but, considering how easily evidence was fabricated in favour of pictures, great caution ought to be shown in the expenditure of large sums of money in this manner.

LORD OVERSTONE said, that as the noble Earl (Earl Granville) could obviously make no other reply than that which might be placed in his hands by those who administered the affairs of the National Gallery, it was more appropriate that these Questions should receive a direct answer from one personally conversant with the subject. That duty would properly have fallen on his noble Friend the Marquess of Northampton, who was not more superior to himself in point of rank than in all those intellectual qualifications which would entitle him to speak with authority upon questions connected with the fine arts; but the noble Marquess being prevented from attending the House by personal infirmity, it devolved upon himself to undertake the task. Their Lordships and the public would feel with him that these Questions involved a grave imputation on the management of the National Gallery; but he trusted the explanation he was about to give would be full and satisfactory. The first Question was that of the noble Lord (Lord De L'Isle and Dudley), who asked upon whose judgment and responsibility the picture of "Christ Blessing Little Children," ascribed to Rembrandt, but supposed to be of little or no value, had been purchased for the price of £7,000? The Question obviously divided itself into two parts—the first of which was, upon whose authority and judgment it was purchased? His answer was, that the Director of the National Gallery was responsible for the purchase. It could not, indeed, be otherwise; the Director of that institution was vested with plenary authority in the choice and purchase of pictures, and nothing could be done except on his judgment and with his full responsibility. But the Director was surrounded by a body of Trustees, to whom he was bound to report all his proceedings. If, in any case, they doubted, dissented, or condemned, it was their duty to record their opinion, which opinion was necessarily laid before Parliament; but if they abstained from any such expression of opinion, they by their silence acquiesced and shared in the responsibility of his acts. In the present case the Director reported to the Trustees in the usual way, and they recorded no dissent, and so they participated in the responsibility. The picture had been exhibited publicly on the walls of the National Gallery for three years; but this was the first time its genuineness had been questioned in this House, and he could not help saying, therefore, that any attack upon it should have been made at an earlier period. In order to show that the Trustees were justified in purchasing the picture as a great work in itself, and as the production of a great Master, he would give a statement of the history of the picture from its execution to the present time. It was believed to have been painted by Rembrandt about 1650, being a date intermediate between the great works which characterized the earlier and those which characterized the later portion of his career. The first trace of it was to be found in the celebrated Pommersfelden Collection, of which there were two catalogues, bearing date 1719 and 1746. It was now impossible to find a copy of the first catalogue, dated 1719; but a copy of the second, bearing date 1746, was happily extant, and he held in his hand a certified extract from it—

> "Specification of the precious paintings preserved in the most noble villa at Vienna belonginging to the Schönborn family, together with their height and width by the Nuremburg foot measure."

Then comes this item — "6. Christ sitting with the innocent children and their parents, by Rembrandt. 6-6, 4-10." The picture remained in the Schönborn Palace at Vienna for 150 years, without its genuineness having ever been questioned, until the year in which it was purchased for the National Gallery, being regarded through the whole of that long period, and by all the art critics of Germany, as the pride and ornament of the Vienna Galleries, and being always spoken of as "the Vienna Rembrandt." He had asked M. Boehm, an eminent modeller and sculptor, now residing in London, whose father, for nearly forty years, was Director of the Art Establishment of the Mint, and Chief Medallist to the Emperor of Austria, what he knew of the picture, and he had received a reply, in which M. Boehm said he had always heard it mentioned as the most important work by Rembrandt in Vienna. He added, that he well recollected the great admiration entertained for it by his father, who was on several occasions consulted by Government on the purchase of works of art, and showed by his fine collection, especially of drawings and etchings by Rembrandt, that his opinion was deservedly valued. M. Boehm went on to say—

> "The picture in question has a particular interest to me, and, though I do not offer my judgment as of any value whatever, I think it right to mention that when asked by Mr. Boxall to enumerate the works of Rembrandt at Vienna, I mentioned this picture first and foremost of all, before I knew anything of the intended purchase by the National Gallery. I never heard the picture doubted at Vienna, and have only known it as the theme of general admiration among all connoisseurs there, occupying a prominent posisition in the Schönborn Gallery. I well remember the powerful impression it always produced upon me, and when I afterwards heard of its acquisition for the National Gallery I rejoiced in the addition of so valuable a picture to the treasures which it contains."

The next testimony which he would quote was Förster's *Handbook of Germany*, 1833, in which the celebrated translator of Vasari, referring to the Schönborn collection, mentioned "Christ Blessing Little Children" as one of "four great works of Rembrandt" to be found there. Voesmaer, in his *Life of Rembrandt*, quoting the opinion of a preceding writer of eminence—Hertscheene, said—

> "The head of Jesus is very fine. He wears a brown dress, with a red mantle. The other figures are painted in colours difficult to describe—greenish brown, red, and dark brown. The figure of Jesus very luminous and masterly painted."

In Nagler's *Art Lexicon*, 1842, the painting was referred to as—

> "The most excellent picture by Rembrandt in the Schönborn Gallery at Vienna. The head of Christ is admirable in character. The rest of the figures are copied from common nature. Moreover, this picture is of the very highest excellence in point of colour, of the greatest transparency in chiaro-scuro, and of most brilliant effect. . . . A magnificent gem in a homely setting."

In the article on Rembrandt in Brockhaus's *Conversations Lexicon*, 1830, was this passage—

> "Among Rembrandt's works is a picture less known, but still more excellent, representing Christ with the Little Children, in the collection of Count Schönborn, Vienna."

Again, M. Burger, in a very elaborate article in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts* for September, 1866, speaking of the picture as being then in the Suermondt Gallery at Aix-la-Chapelle, classed it for its importance and quality in the first rank among Rembrandt's works; and, after remarking that Mr. Suermondt had recently obtained it from the Gallery of the Counts Schönborn, at Vienna, he proceeded to remark—

> ". . . It is remarkable that the mother, carrying her baby on the right arm, whose fine features have an exceptional elegance among Rembrandt's types, appears to be the same as the young mother standing with her back to the spectator, carrying also a baby, and ascending a step towards the Christ, in the celebrated etching known as the 'Hundred Guilders.' . . . The year 1648, the approximative date for the 'Hundred Guilders'

> etching, furnishes us moreover with an indication of the probable date of the 'Christ Blessing Little Children,' and this picture can serve us as an intermediary step between the 'Night Watch' (1642), and the 'Syndics' (1661)."

He would next cite the opinions of the eminent men who, on account of their minute and critical study of pictures, had been intrusted with the care of the chief European galleries. Dr. Waagen, Keeper of the Berlin Gallery, on being consulted by Mr. Suermondt before concluding the purchase, described the picture as "a very remarkable work by the hand of Rembrandt, in an excellent state of preservation, painted between 1645 and 1648," adding that the whole picture was equally powerful, transparent, and harmonious in its effect, and that he could only encourage him to obtain it even for a high price. Cavalier Giuseppe Mollini, of the Brera Gallery at Milan, writing to Mr. Boxall on the acquisition of the picture for the National Gallery, of which he had heard from Mr. Layard, remarked that it made such an impression upon him in 1835 that he recollected it precisely as if he had it now before his eyes; that it was a marvel of light and execution, and that while wanting in a certain quality of beauty, the common defect of Rembrandt, the longer the public looked at it the more would be their surprise and admiration. "For a professional connoisseur," he added, "there is enough to charm him into enthusiasm." M. Reiset, of the Louvre, on visiting the National Gallery, left a card for Mr. Wornum, bearing these words—

> "Thousand thanks and thousand congratulations. . . . The little Garvagh Raphael and the fine Rembrandt from the Counts Schönborn have given me the greatest pleasure."

Chevalier Engert, Director of the Belvedere Gallery at Vienna, regarded the picture as an unquestionable Rembrandt, which did great honour to the National Gallery. He had been favoured, too, by Lady Eastlake with a memorandum from an old note-book of Sir Charles Eastlake, who was in the habit of visiting the principal Continental galleries every summer, and of making short notes for his future guidance. In 1830 he noted this picture as a Rembrandt, with the comment—"Effect of heads in partial shade very beautiful and Correggiesque." Their Lordships would be interested in learning the opinion of the late Lord Taunton, a Nobleman of correct and cultivated taste, so recently and so grievously lost to this House and to the country, as narrated in a letter which he had received from the Solicitor General Sir John Coleridge—

> "I learn that you are desirous to have in writing what I can remember of the few words which fell from Lord Taunton on almost the last day of his life as to the 'Entombment' ascribed to Michael Angelo, and the 'Christ Blessing Little Children' ascribed to Rembrandt. It happened in this way. I had seen him the very day before his death with reference to the University Tests Bill, which he was to assist Lord Russell in conducting, and finding that he was unwell, though he did not speak seriously of his illness, I was a very short time with him, and was just going away, when I stayed for a moment to look at his own fine but unfinished picture, said also to be by Michael Angelo. He said to me that, fine as he thought his own picture, he felt that in some respects the 'Entombment' just placed in the gallery was even finer, and that it was one of the greatest acquisitions we had had there for many years. He went on to express his strong sense of the value of Mr. Boxall's services as Director, and on my saying that I believed the Rembrandt was to be attacked in Parliament, he said that, whoever painted it, he thought it impossible not to see that for impressiveness and for the fine sentiment of it, it was a thoroughly great and noble picture. He spoke on these matters with great strength and decision. I cannot give you his very words. I wish I could. But of the substance I am quite sure, and, if it is of the slightest use, you are very welcome to my evidence. I wish, indeed, with all my heart that the opinions of that high-minded and accomplished gentleman had not become matter of evidence."

He might also mention that when, two years ago, the picture was attacked in the House of Commons, an article appeared in a periodical publication, anonymous, but well known as having been written by an eminent critic on works of art, advising the public to go and judge for themselves, and, instead of consulting any auctioneer, to ask their own hearts whether it was not the work of one of the greatest geniuses that ever recorded humanity and Divinity upon canvass. He had felt bound, considering that the management of the National Gallery was on its trial, to accumulate evidence in its justification, and he felt confident that both their Lordships and the public would come to a decision different from that of the noble Lord opposite. What, he might ask, might have been the effect of missing the opportunity of purchasing this picture? What would have been the taunts and censures directed against the apathy and ignorance of the Director and Trustees if, with this accumulation of evidence before them, they had allowed this important work to become the ornament of some other public Gallery? He would now reply to the Questions of the noble Earl (the Earl of Winchilsea)—and here he felt bound to say that before putting Questions on the Paper noble Lords should be satisfied of the accuracy of the statements on which they were based. The noble Earl's first Question implied that the picture of "The Warrior adoring the Infant Jesus" was not in the official catalogue —whereas it was distinctly and prominently mentioned there; and that it was bought for £3,000, a sum which the noble Earl afterwards discovered to be inaccurate; a public Return laid before Parliament distinctly describes the picture, and gives the price as £525—just one-sixth of the sum named in the Question of the noble Earl. Nor was it bought as a Giorgione, for the catalogue simply stated that, by its former owner, as well as by many others, it was attributed to Giorgione, but that connoisseurs were of opinion that it was of the Venetian school. That picture was bought before the office of Director of the National Gallery was instituted. The late Lord Lansdowne with Sir Charles Eastlake and himself had taken upon themselves the responsibility of purchasing it, and it was exhibited for a long period in an obviously damaged condition; it had since undergone restoration under the personal superintendence of Mr. Boxall: it is a perfect masterpiece of restoration, and he could not understand how any man of taste or judgment could pass it by without stopping to pay to it the tribute of his admiration. Passing to the next Question of the noble Earl, which referred to what he was pleased to call "a certain spurious 'Ecce Homo' purporting to be a Correggio," he might observe that it formed one of a very valuable collection of pictures which had been bequeathed to the nation by the Rev. Holwell Carr. It was, at the time the bequest was made, in a frame on which was inscribed the words —"Ludovico Caracci after Correggio," and in that frame it remained until the Trustees of the National Gallery were fortunate enough to secure the original picture by Correggio. It was then withdrawn; and when the noble Lord asked whether the proceeds were carried to the national account — which must be understood to imply that the picture had been sold and the money surreptitiously kept back—for if it did not mean that it meant nothing, and he was perfectly willing to admit it meant nothing—he must inform him that it was placed in one of the private rooms under the gallery, to which the noble Earl might have free access, and where he would find that the picture was still in the possession of the nation, untouched, and with the same frame and inscription to which he had already referred. That answer would, he hoped, be satisfactory to the noble Earl. He would, in the next place, say a few words about "The Entombment of Christ," by Michael Angelo, which had recently been added to the national collection, and with respect to which he would trouble their Lordships with the following notice, which seemed to him to be an admirable specimen of criticism of the highest kind—

> "There is no history to guide us as to the authorship of this picture; we must therefore trust entirely to the internal evidence of the work itself. It will not I think be questioned by those conversant with art that the 'Entombment' is the production of a sculptor. The style of the composition, the profound knowledge of form, and the subtle feeling displayed in the modelling of every part, satisfy us that it must be the work of a hand trained in the severe requirements of sculpture. As the eye passes over the picture we become conscious of the delicate modulation of every muscle, as if studied in clay or wrought in marble. Of this the figure of the dead Christ is a wonderful example. The exquisite beauty and expression of the head, the type of Michael Angelo alone, has perhaps never been surpassed. St. John and the Magdalen supporting the body are grandly designed. The action of the Magdalen is majestic, and full of passionate grief, and the woman standing silent behind her is the personation of unspeakable sorrow. We feel the presence of a great mind throughout the whole of this work, notwithstanding its rugged and unfinished condition. It was probably executed about the end of the 15th century—a youthful effort left incomplete by the artist either from fastidiousness or from the consciousness of its many faults of proportion; the very faults which characterize, especially in his early works, the great painter-sculptor whose name we have not hesitated to connect with this picture. No other name is known to us to which it can be attributed."

That was the criticism of Mr. Boxall, the Director of our National Gallery, but the same picture was criticized by a foreigner, Baron de Triquetti — and foreigners, as was well-known, are reasonably jealous of the acquisition for the National Gallery of great works of art. Yet Baron de Triquetti did not hesitate to bear the following generous testimony to the value of the "Entombment of Christ":—

> "The discovery of a picture by Michael Angelo, important, indisputable, but respecting which history has hitherto been silent, cannot fail to excite a lively interest among all who are interested in high art. It is to the Director of the National Gallery of London this good fortune has occurred. He has enriched the Gallery confided to his care with a work of the highest excellence. We are already acquainted with two pictures well authenticated, by the great painter of the Sistine Chapel; we shall henceforth recognize three:—1, 'La Vierge d'Agnolo Dono,' one of the glories of the Tribuna, in Florence; 2, 'La Vierge aux Anges,' of Lord Taunton, in England; 3, 'La Mise au Tombeau,' of the National Gallery. Mr. Boxall alone has had the intuitive sagacity to discover this concealed treasure. He has had the courage to face the censures which want of success would have brought down upon him. The cleaning and repair of this work will henceforth be one of its glories. This work has been a masterpiece of carefulness, patience, skill, and, above all, of deep respect for the Master. The Director of the National Gallery has in this matter established his claim upon the gratitude of all true lovers of art."

The National Gallery was, it is true, very limited in extent, but in that limited extent it contained, by the universal acknowledgment of every foreign critic, an unusually large proportion of works of unquestionably high merit. To fill the important post of Director to such an institution it was necessary that a man should be a thorough gentleman, a man of high education, actuated by honourable and pure feelings, as well as one who was fond of art and sensitive in his taste with regard to it, and in all those respects he believed the present Director was eminently qualified for the position which he occupied. He felt this testimony to be due to a public servant, called upon to discharge duties of a difficult and very delicate nature, and exposed to criticisms of very varied character. The present acknowledged excellence of our National Gallery—not complete, but peculiarly select so far as it has been carried—sufficiently testifies to the efficiency of our late Director, Sir Charles Eastlake, and our present Director, Mr. Boxall. Whenever this office shall again become vacant, fortunate indeed shall we be if a successor be found, possessing the same rare combination of qualities, and competent to complete the collection with which the country ought now to be well pleased, and, indeed, justly proud. He would conclude by appealing with confidence to the sympathy of their Lordships in support of those who had used, and were using, every means in their power to render the national collection of pictures worthy of this great country.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, they must all feel obliged to the noble Lord (Lord Overstone) for his explanation, which showed that the Trustees displayed their judgment without fear or favour in choosing pictures for the National Gallery. If, indeed, there were any part of the noble Lord's speech with which he felt inclined to find fault, it was that in which he appeared to be more than displeased at these Questions having been put. The noble Lord must be aware that Questions of this kind, when asked in either House, were not only perfectly fair in a Parliamentary point of view, but were likewise a proof of the great interest felt by the public in the success of the National Gallery. He was sure that the noble Lord himself did not desire that the people of this country should wander in stupid silence through the rooms in which these pictures were hung, and no one with such a liberal mind as his could find fault with the remarks and criticisms, however extraordinary, which those who inspected the treasures of art preserved in the Gallery might make. These were after all, nothing more nor less than expressions of opinion. The noble lord had styled the Questions put to him this evening as ungenerous Questions; but for his own part he (the Earl of Malmesbury) thought they were evidences of the pride and interest which all persons in this country, whatever their rank might be, took in the art treasures which were to be found in our National Gallery. He maintained that it was entirely a matter of opinion as to whether a picture were genuine or not, and more especially must this be the case with regard to pictures painted by the Old Masters. When it was considered that upwards of three centuries had elapsed since the Venetians put their pencils to the canvass, it was obviously impossible to have what in a court of justice would be called complete and positive evidence that such and such a picture was painted by such and such a man who lived in the 16th century; all we could do was to trace the pedigrees and successive owners of these pictures, and to draw an inference from the facts as to whether they were genuine or not.

Most of the paintings in the National Gallery had, he believed, passed through that ordeal, and might be regarded with pride and confidence as genuine works of the Masters to whom they were ascribed. If it had not been for the Questions put this evening, the public would not have had the advantage of being acquainted with the complete pedigrees of the pictures to which the noble Lord had referred. Considering the great difficulty of identifying ancient pictures, he could not but admire the characteristic sagacity of a certain class of collectors—he meant those men who, having in the course of a life of practical business accumulated large fortunes, and having great taste and a desire to form galleries of pictures, almost universally discarded the Old School and laid out their money in purchasing modern pictures, the genuineness of which could be ascertained far more readily than the authenticity of works alleged to be by the Old Masters. This circumstance showed that the public were excusable if they were suspicious and timid with respect to purchasing pictures of the Old Masters; and the noble Lord and his Colleagues—for whose exertions he felt assured the country was deeply grateful—must occasionally expect Questions similar to those which had been asked this evening. The noble Lord had quoted various authorities; but it would not be difficult to show that those authorities did not agree among themselves. He himself possessed a picture which for the last 100 years had been deemed to be an undoubted Giorgione. Some lovers of art used to come to look at it two or three times a week, and he had a letter from the late Sir Charles Eastlake, in which he stated it was one of the finest Giorgiones he had ever seen. Yet when he sent that picture to the Exhibition at Paris, a gentleman employed at the Louvre pronounced it to be the work, not of Giorgoine, but of another Venetian master. Indeed, he believed there was only one way of discovering the real authors of these ancient pictures—namely, by calling in the aid of spiritualism, and bringing ourselves into correspondence with Mr. Home, who should be requested to interrogate Giorgione, Titian, and other great artists on the subject. Until their Lordships believed in spiritualism, however, they must rely upon opinions such as had been adduced this evening by the noble Lord (Lord Overstone.)

VISCOUNT HARDINGE said, he had not gathered from the statements of the noble Lords that they intended to impugn generally the management of the National Gallery. He was extremely glad that they had raised this question, and he could not think they had done so in any hostile spirit, and they had elicited very satisfactory answers from the noble Lord (Lord Overstone). It appeared to him that the Director and Trustees of the National Gallery had a rather hard task to perform; but he was bound to say that, generally speaking, they had performed it in a highly satisfactory manner. In regard to the pictures which formed the subject of the present discussion, he would not, after the very elaborate evidence which the noble Lord opposite had produced of their genuineness, venture to express any very decided opinion of his own. As to the disputed Rembrandt he believed it to be a genuine picture. It had been described by Sir Edwin Landseer as a very fine conception, with a very coarse frame. In his own opinion, it was a very fine picture, though somewhat deficient in purity and refinement. The questions concerning the other pictures, especially the "Ecce Homo" and "The Warrior adoring the Infant Jesus," had been satisfactorily disposed of by the noble Lord opposite. As to the Michael Angelo, it was very doubtful whether the controversy would ever be settled; though he was inclined to think that the picture was an original. Great credit was due to the Directors for having bought so fine a work for £2,000. While on that subject he could not help expressing a hope that there would be no further delay in proceeding with the erection of the new National Gallery. If matters went on as they now did he feared that few of their Lordships would live to see the completion of the projected new building.

EARL GRANVILLE said, it had been a question raised in a late discussion whether it would not have been an advantage to have had Sir Joshua Reynolds among them as a Member of that House. If Sir Joshua had been a Member of that House he could not have added to what had fallen from his noble Friend (Lord Overstone), for he could only have given them his own individual opinion on a subject like that now before them; whereas his noble Friend had given them the opinions of various competent authorities. What the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) had said as to the difficulty arising in these matters through great authorities disagreeing only rendered the argument so much the stronger when, as in this case, they found all those great authorities absolutely agreeing upon any one point. As to his noble Friend (Lord Overstone) complaining of the Questions being put, he apprehended that his noble Friend and all of their Lordships were of opinion that it was very desirable, in any matter in which the public took an interest, or on which any doubt, whether rightly or wrongly, was entertained, that a Question be put in regard to it. What he believed his noble Friend thought was that it would be better to avoid influencing the public beforehand on the subject, and to put such Questions in a rather plainer and less epigrammatic form.

POLICE (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE rose to call the attention of the House to the inefficiency of the police and magisterial arrangements for the prevention of crime or detection of criminals in Ireland. The administration of justice in Ireland was a disgrace to the Empire, and most injurious to that country. It was but too notorious that the most horrible crimes were committed in Ireland in open day with perfect impunity; that assassins went through the length and breadth of the land perpetrating murder and outrage, and that the Government of the country, with all the power at its command, seemed to be unable to stop such violence. This state of things was notorious to all the world, and he need not trouble their Lordships with any proof; but he might read from a newspaper an extract, based on statistics, giving the unpunished crimes of the last fifteen or sixteen months in Ireland, beginning with the murder of Mr. Featherstonhaugh and ending with the attempt to murder Mr. Warburton. Within that period eleven victims of these outrages had been killed, three had been severely wounded, and only two or three of the cases at the outside were not agrarian in character. In one case only had the murderers been brought to punishment, and in one more a conviction was hoped for; but no life had been forfeited for so many lives taken. The number of agrarian outrages reported, exclusive of Fenian crimes—and without any mention of the county of Cork—had risen from 87 in the year 1866 to 123 in 1867, and 160 in 1868. All that showed that the Government were powerless, and that the assassins were without the least dread. The persons injured durst not come forward to swear informations against the criminals, because of the system of terrorism which these murderers created. It might be said that all that was an old story; that such outrages were common twenty, thirty, and forty years ago. He asked how many convictions there were twenty, thirty, or forty years ago in proportion to the outrages committed? Were they as numerous now as they were then; or were the offences similar? Formerly the Government had been successful in putting down the crimes of the Ribbon and other conspirators in Ireland. Since that time Ireland had enjoyed the advantages of Catholic emancipation, the odious tithe system had been done away with, and a system of national education had long been in operation; yet the fearful crimes to which he was referring were now committed with impunity—and this although a very numerous and costly constabulary force existed. Formerly their police in Ireland was not regularly organized. In 1823 Mr. Plunkett, then Attorney General for Ireland, brought forward a plan of police which was to cost £240,000. In 1845 the force was immensely increased, and its cost was £440,000. At present the public paid for the Irish constabulary a total sum of £899,871 per annum, including £29,359 from the Irish counties. The cost of the seventy-two stipendiary magistrates was £28,900. He knew it was only in particular parts of Ireland that the outrages of which he complained prevailed; but it was to these particular parts that the Government ought to turn their attention, and see whether they could not do something with the force they had at command. Could the Government complain that Parliament had refused them any coercive powers they wanted? Had they not at this moment an Arms Act, and yet people were carrying arms every day in the most notorious manner? There were five different counties in which those outrages prevailed — Westmeath, Leitrim, Tipperary, Galway, and the Queen's County. It was only on Saturday last that the newspapers stated that another outrage had been committed, the details of which were given more at large in the papers of to-day, and, although no life was lost, the character of this outrage showed at once the truth of his assertions. It appeared that a man was employed as a surveyor to define the boundaries of two different estates; but the people thinking that he had come down for the purposes of valuation and raising the rents fell upon him, threatened him, took away his maps and papers, and fired shots in the open day. And where did all this occur but within a few miles of that notorious place, Ballycohey, where such dreadful murders had been perpetrated last year. Now, what were the police about, what were the magistrates about, what were the Government about? for, if there was any place in Ireland in which such doings should have been impossible it was in that very place. He had no doubt that the people who had perpetrated this outrage would also escape punishment. In the Queen's County the other day there was the Judge, the grand jury, and the whole police force of the county all collected together, and yet in the middle of the day, on the high road, Mr. Warburton was shot at and wounded. He hoped that gentleman would recover; but the heinousness of the outrage was the same. Well, it might be asked—"What are your remedies?" There were two. In the first place, the Government ought to establish a more really effective constabulary force, with a separate detective branch, such as existed in England; and, in the second place, they ought to put themselves into communication with the loyal, honest feeling of the country. For, with all the power at their disposal, they could not do by means of the stipendiary magistrates what had been done by the local gentry with far inferior means at their command. He would take the liberty of reading the language of a very great man, one of the best Lord Lieutenants that Ireland ever had—he meant Lord Wellesley—and show what his conduct had been under similar circumstances. Lord Wellesley did not disdain to go to the gentry of the country and consult them, he did not disdain to come to Parliament, and he had no army of police magistrates throughout the country. He could recollect the state in which many counties of Ireland were in 1822, when Lord Wellesley, by his resolution, skill, and the judicious use of the means at his disposal, aided by the local gentry, who displayed as much courage, activity, and skill, as the present police, when called upon to fight, had shown, succeeded in putting down the disturbances. The Marquess of Wellesley, in a despatch, dated January 19th, 1823, said—

> "The new police had been introduced into the lately-disturbed districts and into others with general approbation, with the cordial and effective co-operation of the magistrates, with great success in the detection of crime, the speedy apprehension of offenders, and the maintenance of public peace. . . . I, some time since, submitted to you a separate despatch, relative to the trial and conviction of several persons denominated Ribbonmen. . . . It is, at least, an advantage to the King's Government to have completely and publicly exposed the whole craft and mystery of the Ribbon Conspiracy."

How did the Marquess of Wellesley do all that? By communicating with the local gentry and seeking their co-operation. These gentlemen could, of course, give him more information than the disciplined soldiers who were called the constabulary, but who were, properly speaking, no more police than they were Life-Guards. In 1862, the grand jury of the South Riding of Tipperary assembled at the Special Commission, held in Clonmel, drew up a representation to the Government, in which they stated that they considered it their imperative duty to call the attention of the Government to the constitution of the constabulary, which for some years had become a mere military force, quite useless for the detection and apprehension of offenders against the law, or the prevention of crime. Any noble Lord connected with Ireland would bear him out in saying that that representation to the Government, in 1862, was founded on strict justice. But he would like to know what answer was sent to it, or what was done in consequence of it? The advice of the Irish gentry was not taken—although, by-the-by, the very first attempt to stop Fenianism was made by a meeting of magistrates in the county of Cork. not called together by order of the Lord Lieutenant, but, he believed, very much complained of by the Government, who said their proceedings were premature. But if the Government had been in communication with the magistrates, and they were meditating a premature movement, it would be easy to stop them. He implored the Government to turn their attention seriously to this subject. They had now passed the Irish Church Bill, which he most anxiously hoped and sincerely believed would go a long way to conciliate the great body of the people of Ireland; but it would not prevent assassins and murderers from doing their evil deeds. He believed that the Irish on the whole were the best conducted people on the face of the earth; but in a population of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 they could not do without a well-organized police. He entreated their Lordships to impress upon the Government the necessity of taking this subject into their serious consideration. He could do no more than call attention to it; but if the country was not in a better condition next year he would certainly move their Lordships to grant a Select Committee—and it was quite open to them to make it a Secret Committee. It was, he believed, a long time since there had been a Secret Committee of their Lordships' House, but, nevertheless, it might be appointed. We were paying now the most enormous sum that ever was paid in any agricultural country for the police. In the rural counties of Ireland they had a police which, as a detective force, was useless. A Friend of his—a Member of Parliament—was travelling only a few weeks ago when he thought he had been robbed of his watch. Seeing a smart, well-dressed man among those who gathered round him, he accosted him as a detective, and was right. So it was always; the police of Ireland were as well drilled and bespoke their profession in their bearing as clearly as any soldier of the Line; but the detective should be a civilian to the back-bone, who had never been drilled, as like his fellow-citizens as possible, and singular only in his ability at thief-taking.

LORD DUFFERIN regretted that he was unable to offer any reply to the observations of the noble Marquess beyond repeating the assurance he had before given to their Lordships—that the Government deplored quite as earnestly as the noble Lord, or any of their Lordships, those atrocious crimes to which he had alluded. But he was obliged to remind the noble Marquess that he had somewhat over-stated the facts of the case, for he had included the whole of Ireland in his condemnation; whereas, as he (Lord Dufferin) had before stated, these crimes were confined to a comparatively small area. Knowing how intimately acquainted the noble Marquess was with everything connected with the administration of Ireland, he had listened with considerable attention in the hope that he would submit some scheme which the Government could adopt; but the suggestions of the noble Marquess resolved themselves into two recommendations—the institution of a secret police, and the establishment of a more complete concert between the Government and the local gentry. Both in his private capacity as an Irish landlord, and also as a Member of the Government, he admitted that the first suggestion of the noble Marquess had much to recommend itself; and he would go further and say that such an obvious method of detecting crime had not escaped the attention of the Government; but, for obvious reasons, it would be extremely unwise to enter at length upon this occasion into any details as to the circumstances under which the Government might resort to the system. As to the nature of the relations which existed between the Executive and the magistrature of the country, from his own experience he could say that he did not think that any just complaint could be made as to the inaccessibility of the Government to any recommendations or suggestions emanating from that body. It was altogether beyond his own experience that any complaint could be alleged in this respect. He felt the slur that these outrages cast upon everyone connected with Ireland, and he assured their Lordships that not only the Lord Lieutenant, but the whole of the Government felt as acutely as possible the deep responsibility that rested upon them to use every method and device known to the administration of justice to bring the authors of these atrocious crimes to punishment.

EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 110.)

(*The Lord Penzance.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD PENZANCE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that he must, in the first place, recall to their Lordships' recollection the great change which was made in the law some years ago, by the 14 & 15 *Vict.*, c. 99, which for the first time allowed parties to certain suits to give their own accounts of the transactions out of which the litigation arose. The change was of a most marked and serious character, and no one who had practised in the courts of law since that change was made doubted its expediency, or hesitated to pronounce it a most successful measure. But suits on account of breach of promise of marriage and adultery were excepted by this enactment, and it was with these exceptions the present Bill proposed to deal. As regards suits for breach of promise, it was proposed simply to do away with the exception. He would only say, as to this part of the matter, that it was the opinion of most lawyers that the Bill in this respect would be an unquestionable improvement. The exception in cases of adultery had wrought much evil, alogether independent of the object aimed at by the framers of the law. It was thought by many, himself included, that it was undesirable anyone should be put into a witness-box, and be asked whether he or she had been guilty of adultery; and the sympathy for a person placed in that position—especially a man whose admission involved the public dishonour of a woman—dictated the exception on this head. But the form of the exception was this—instead of providing simply that the question as to whether he or she had committed adultery should not be put, it was provided that parties to suits instituted on account of adultery should not be examined as witnesses. It happened that in the Court over which he presided many suits were instituted on account of adultery which involved other questions, and the exception had had the effect of shutting the mouths of the parties to the suit as regards questions—say, of desertion and cruelty—when, in many cases, they alone could speak directly to the facts; and the result had been to cause very great expense in bringing witnesses from all parts of the country to prove facts within the knowledge of the parties to the suit. As the Act was passed before the Divorce Court was established, the result was plainly fortuitous; and there seemed to be no reason on earth why a man or woman should not be asked any questions touching the adultery of either husband or wife, and yet a suit being instituted on account of adultery made it impracticable. There was another evil which followed from the exception. Whatever might be said as to the propriety of asking a witness whether he or she had committed adultery, there seemed no such objection in a suit between husband and wife to asking one party as to the adultery of the other. It was even possible, under the present law, for a man to go into a room and find his wife in the act of adultery, and yet be incompetent to state the fact in evidence. Had it not been that some amendment had been made in the original law, the business of the Divorce Court could not have been carried on at all; and, as it was, the Act making that amendment, the 22 & 23 *Vict.*, c. 61, led to fresh inequalities, by limiting the repeal of the exception to only two cases, in order to allow a woman to prove cruelty and desertion by her husband. The amendment permitted the husband and wife to give evidence in cases where the suit was instituted by the wife on the ground of cruelty and desertion. But this only met the case where the wife was the petitioner; for, unfortunately, if the husband brought a charge of adultery and the wife answered it by a charge of cruelty and adultery, she could not be a witness upon the subject of cruelty, because the suit was instituted on the ground of adultery. Then, other evils arose connected with costs. The husband brought a charge of adultery against his wife, who, knowing she could not be a witness in that case, brought a cross-suit on the ground of cruelty, in order that she might speak. Thus the husband had to pay the costs of two suits, when one would serve the purpose. Thus the law, as it now stood, was full of anomalies. It excluded evidence not intended to be excluded, and it admitted that intended to be shut out; it did not exclude evidence where adultery came up by way of recrimination, but it did exclude it where adultery was charged in the petition. Again, the law did not cover the case of an action brought by a third person—say by a tradesman against a husband for necessaries supplied to the wife; in that case, if adultery were alleged, there was nothing to prevent the parties getting into the witness-box. He would add a word, on the question whether there was any objection to the parties being examined on the direct charge of adultery. Was there really any reason why a petitioner or a respondent should not be allowed to get into the witness-box, and by his or her explanation get rid of the suspicion which circumstances had raised against them? For want of this power great injustice was often done. Appearances were very often strong against a man and woman; admissions made, or said to have been made, were given in evidence against them, yet they were not permitted to get into the witness-box and give their own account; and, in many cases, this was a great hardship. The Bill as it stood said not only that the parties to any action for breach of promise should be "competent," but should be "compellable"—and, as regards suits instituted in consequence of adultery, it also provided that they should be "compellable." But such a provision respecting the parties to the suit must be a dead letter, for the plaintiff would not call the defendant, nor the defendant the plaintiff; and the Bill would be just as valuable if the word were struck out, and if it simply said that the parties should be competent to give evidence. For ten years the Court of Divorce had been harassed and hampered by the action upon each other of two Acts of Parliament without any common design between them; and he therefore rejoiced that this Bill had been passed by the Commons to correct a gross anomaly which could not be well defended. The House of Commons had added a provision to protect witnesses against being compelled to criminate themselves, and he was satisfied that it would be sufficient for the purpose.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Penzance.*)

LORD CHELMSFORD said, he had the greatest possible confidence in the judgment of the noble and learned Lord who had charge of the Bill, and whose experience in the court over which he presided rendered his opinion of so much value, and it was, therefore, with hesitation and doubt that he ventured to make some remarks against it. He could not however help entertaining very serious apprehensions as to the danger that would be incurred from the admission of the evidence of parties in such cases as those to which this Bill referred. This was not only a legal question—it was also a moral and a social one, upon which every one of their Lordships was as competent to form an opinion as any of the legal Peers. When the first Bill on the subject was brought forward by Lord Brougham he said that the exceptions in reference to proceedings in adultery and actions for breach of promise were forced upon him against his will; but it was quite clear that the opinion of the majority of persons then was that the exceptions should be introduced. In 1865 the present Lord Chief Baron, then Sir Fitzroy Kelly, introduced into the House of Commons a Bill in which there were two clauses for admitting the evidence of parties in these two cases. The Bill was read a second time, but in Committee the two clauses were struck out, and the Bill was therefore dropped. In 1866, the then Lord Chancellor (Lord Cranworth) introduced a Bill containing similar clauses, which enacted that the parties should be competent, but not compellable to give evidence. Personally, he (Lord Chelmsford) thought there was no serious practical distinction between the two forms of expression, for it was clear that if persons were competent to give evidence, even though they were not compellable, if they failed to present themselves to rebut the charges made against them they would subject themselves to unfavourable observations, and their silence would probably be fatal to their case. On that occasion the only speakers were the Lord Chancellor, himself, and the late Lord Taunton, who also took the view he did as to the danger of admitting evidence of this kind. On a division the House was equally divided, and the Bill, therefore, fell to the ground. These facts indicated great difference of opinion upon the propriety of admitting evidence of this kind; and, as he said at that time, he certainly felt that the proposed change would open the floodgates of perjury. Take the case of proceedings by a husband against a wife for adultery. It was quite clear that her character and position in life — everything she could hold dear — being involved, the temptation to commit perjury was so strong as in many cases to be utterly irresistible. A woman who had already broken one commandment would not scruple to break another in order to protect herself. Again, a co-respondent might feel it a point of honour to protect the woman with whom he had committed adultery, though at the expense of perjury. Shortly before he left the Bar there occurred an action of what was then termed *crim. con.* in which the verdict went against the defendant. The husband applied to the Ecclesiastical Court for a divorce *a mensâ et thoro;* but the defendant in the action appeared and swore positively no adultery had been committed. The husband then indicted him for perjury. It was at this point that he (Lord Chelmsford) first heard of the case, being retained for the defendant. He felt that the result must be against his client unless the wife was called to deny the adultery. And, in consultation, he stated this inevitable consequence; though, of course, without any advice as to her being called or not. At the trial she appeared as a witness, and swore that no adultery was committed, and the defendant was, after some hesitation of the jury, acquitted. In the meantime Parliament had established the Divorce Court, and the husband proceeded in that court for a divorce, and the adultery being clearly proved he obtained it; and one of the first acts of his official life as Lord Chancellor was, on the application of the Lord Lieutenant, to strike the name of the defendant out of the Commission of the Peace. This case showed how difficult it was for persons to resist the temptation—a woman to defend herself from the consequences of adultery being established against her, and a man, from a feeling of honour—if it must be so called—to protect the woman with whom he had committed adultery. It was that feeling that induced him to apprehend considerable danger from the admission of evidence of this kind. He admitted, with his noble and learned Friend, that the state of the law with regard to evidence in cases of this description was in an anomalous position, and he should be glad if his noble and learned Friend would introduce an Act to remove those anomalies, without going the length of admitting the evidence of parties charged with adultery. He would now turn to the question of the evidence proposed to be admitted in actions for breach of promise of marriage. At present cases of this kind are proved by letters, or promises made in the presence of witnesses, the evidence of the plaintiff being expressly excluded. His noble and learned Friend behind him (Lord Cairns) had informed him that in Ireland they had a curious way of getting over the difficulty which at present existed in the way of procuring the admission of the plaintiff's evidence. In the charge against the defendant a count for assault and battery is inserted, and upon this the lady herself is called, and proves, with the assistance of friends, the promise made to her. He had known cases of this kind where letters in support of the promise were forged; and where, of course, if the party had been a witness, she would not have scrupled to support her forgery by perjury. If the plaintiff's evidence—generally a woman—is admitted, and it establishes a promise, the denial of the defendant will stand little chance of a favourable reception, when all the sympathies of a jury will be sure to be with the weaker sex. Every case of seduction will be turned into an action for breach of promise of marriage, and a jury will easily be persuaded that the woman's virtue only yielded to such a promise. He could not think it safe to admit such evidence unless some precaution is introduced against the probability of its abuse. In cases of affiliation, the evidence of the mother is not received without some corroboration. So if that extension of the law of evidence is to be made, it ought not to be without acquiring some additional proof. By an Act of Charles II. no action can be brought upon a promise in consideration of marriage unless the promise is in writing; but this does not apply to mutual promises to marry. He thought that the plaintiff's evidence ought to be supported by some writing, or, at all events, by some corroborative proof from other witnesses. He did not intend to oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, but he trusted that the points to which he had referred would receive attention.

LORD DENMAN was understood to oppose the "questionable shape" in which the Bill was presented for a second reading.

LORD CAIRNS said, that this Bill dealt with several questions which stood upon a different footing, and it was only to one of them that his noble and learned Friend (Lord Penzance) had directed their attention. He had called attention to the anomalous state of the law of evidence in the court over which he so ably presided; and had his noble and learned Friend confined his enactment to that question he would have bowed to his opinion. But there were two other portions of the Bill which stood upon a different footing. One of them was the question relating to breach of promise of marriage, which frequently entered into allegations supported by mere passing words. If power were given to examine the parties it would be found that men and women would be swearing as to the use of words which, after a lapse of time, might be made to wear a very different colour from that which they wore when originally spoken; and seeing that the sympathies of juries were with the woman and against the man, it would be a great anomaly, he thought, to allow a proceeding such as that to which he was referring to be supported by merely verbal testimony which could not be met by verbal testimony on the other side. The third part of the Bill seemed to him, he might add, to be of great importance, inasmuch as it proposed to abolish, for the first time, oaths altogether in civil proceedings, not out of regard to any religious scruple, or for any of those other reasons which had hitherto prevailed, but simply on the ground of *sic volo*. That was a proposal which in his opinion, was open to very great objection. In other respects the Bill was a very valuable one; but he hoped that the two points he had maintained would be carefully considered by their Lordships when it was in Committee.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he saw no reason why the exceptions aimed at in this Bill should be allowed to continue. When the alteration was first made in the law of evidence by which the parties to a suit were allowed to be witnesses in their own case, leaving it to the jury to estimate the value of their testimony, he was entirely in favour of the change. He had, however, felt a strong objection at the time, which was not now, perhaps, entirely removed, as to the extension of that particular benefit to the suits of husbands and wives *inter se*. He thought it might lead to a disturbance of the peace of families. But as it had pleased the Legislature to take a different view, he did not, he must confess, see why the exceptions with which the Bill proposed to deal should remain, especially as the peace and harmony of families would in those particular cases have already been destroyed. With reference to the third part of the Bill, which permitted persons to give evidence without being sworn, he must say that he heartily concurred in that object, because he had long been of opinion that it was undesirable to draw a distinction between the duty of telling the truth at all times, and the duty of telling it in a court of law. He was convinced that all that was necessary in giving evidence in a court of justice was that, instead of taking an oath, a witness should know that he had a solemn duty to perform, for any breach of which he would be liable to a legal penalty.

LORD PENZANCE expressed his readiness, if it should be deemed desirable, to omit the provision with respect to the taking of oaths in Committee.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly; and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

BANKRUPTCY BILL—(No. 208.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[*Temporary Provisions.*]

LORD CAIRNS expressed his regret that the Government had refused to increase the salary of Mr. Commissioner Bacon, who was to be appointed the Chief Judge of the new Court. He also pointed out that some of the details in these compensation clauses were of no entirely novel kind.

LORD PENZANCE said, that he also was dissatisfied with the clauses—especially with the proposal that in some cases the compensation was granted on the condition that the recipients should, if called upon, perform the duties of some other office—possibly in a remote part of the country. Such clauses would have the effect of narrowing their choice of fit men to fill public offices, and, instead of economy to the public, the result would be exactly the opposite. They were also a great hardship upon these officers — many of whom were of advanced age.

Lord ROMILLY regarded the clauses as a violation of the rights of property, by which altogether not quite £1,000 would be wrung from the pittance of these unfortunate men. The clause, which would inflict great hardship, was suddenly introduced in the other House near the close of the discussion in Committee; and he would suggest that, as the rules of the House did not permit the clause to be altered, it would be wiser and more reasonable to strike it out in order that the matter might be re-considered, and a new clause really meeting the exigencies of the case be inserted when the Bill went down to the House of Commons.

The LORD CHANCELLOR explained the circumstances under which the Government had modified their original proposal to appoint as Chief Judge in Bankruptcy one of the Judges of the Superior Courts. As the Bill was originally framed it gave the office of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy to one of the Judges of the Superior Courts. These Judges now consisted of six in each Court; and it was thought that one Judge of each Court, either of law or equity, might take upon him the duties of the Court of Bankruptcy, on the understanding that he should not be compelled to travel on circuit while acting in bankruptcy. Sir Roundell Palmer suggested that it would be imprudent to hand the jurisdiction over to the Common Law Courts when there were already Judges in Bankruptcy who could take the Chief Judgeship without calling on the Judges of law or equity. And they accordingly offered to the acceptance of Mr. Commissioner Bacon the position of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, that arrangement having been recommended to them in the other House as one that would avoid additional charge to the country, and prevent a waste of money in compensation. With respect to the question of the salaries of officers, there were two classes of officers. The first consisted of the Commissioners, who held for life or during good behaviour. The second class consisted of Registrars and Official Assignees, who did not stand in the same position as the first class, being subject to removal by the Lord Chancellor for cause shown. They were remunerated by fees; the clause provided that their fees should be ascertained on a proper and fair average, and then that those officers should receive a sum amounting to not less than two-thirds of their average fees. His noble and learned Friend (Lord Romilly) was not correct in saying that this was introduced at the last moment. So far from that being the case, there was a good deal of discussion on the matter in "another place," and those who did not hold by good behaviour addressed him very fully, and so did their friends. There was therefore no surprise. Great blame had been thrown on the Government for bringing in matters in that way; but on that occasion the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the late Government (Mr. Hunt) and Mr. Sclater-Booth very honourably said that they had known exactly the same difficulty to arise at another time when a certain clause was brought in without consultation with the Treasury, and they had taken it upon themselves to alter it. He had the full approbation of the Treasury for proposing that those who held during good behaviour should have their full salaries, and those who did not should never receive less than two-thirds. There were plenty of precedents for this proposal. With regard to Clause 133, the case was this—if a person was compensated with full salary his whole time was paid for, and they ought to be entitled to say to him—"Here is an office under the Act. You give up one office; take another." There were precedents for that. When the Court of Chancery was reformed they threw on the Vice Chancellors one day's work more per week than they had before. They gave them exactly six hours' additional work. Again, under a former Bankruptcy Bill, Sir George Rose, who was one of the three Judges, had his office abolished; but he was afterwards offered the post of Master in Chancery, and he very honourably took it. He could not see that there was any breach of faith in asking gentlemen who should receive the full amount of their salaries to accept a new office. If anyone retired on less than his full salary the case would be different, for he would not be paid for all his time. He should be willing, however, to amend the clause, so that it might run thus—"Any office or employment of equal or greater salary under this Act." In that way no gentleman could feel aggrieved on being asked to accept a new office.

LORD DENMAN expressed a hope that, in offering employment to any one pensioned under the Bankruptcy Act, regard would be had to the place of residence of the person who might be offered employment.

EARL GRANVILLE said, law authorities would always take care of members of the profession.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that any Chancellor would be careful for the interest of any person who might reasonably object to change his residence.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT BILL.

(The Lord Chancellor.)

(NO. 168.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD ROMILLY deprecated continuing the power of imprisonment for debt in the hands of County Courts as was proposed in the 1st clause. He believed the power of imprisonment for debt was very injurious. Credit was given for goods sold in the ordinary way only because the vendor believed the purchaser would be able to pay, and not because he thought he should be obliged to have resort to compulsory measures; and the fear of imprisonment benefited no one but the tallyman, who was thereby enabled to force his goods on the unwary poor, and relied almost exclusively on the compulsory power of imprisonment. He did not approve the distinction made in the Bill between debts for £30 and £50 with respect to imprisonment, a distinction which was wholly irrational. In some respects the abolition of imprisonment for debt seemed to be perfect, but in others it was not. He had given notice of some Amendments based upon these views, but, having placed them on record, he did not wish to press them.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 224.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Nine o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 26th July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Resolutions [July 22] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Charity Commissioners * [239]; Accounts, &c. Presentation * [240]; Bishops Resignation * [241]; Seamen's Clothing * [242]; Queen Anne's Bounty (Superannuation Allowances) * [243].

Second Reading—Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment * [236]; Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) * [237]; Habitual Criminals * [73]; New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment * [225].

Committee—Report—Telegraph [233].

Considered as amended — Fisheries (Ireland) * [190]; Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * [217]; Metropolitan Buildings Act (1855) Amendment * [214]; Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * [53].

Third Reading—Valuation of Property (Metropolis) * [11]; Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * [217]; Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment * [214]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * [191], and *passed.*

SHIPPING DUES IN FOREIGN PORTS.

QUESTION.

MR. STEVENSON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps Her Majesty's Government have taken on the complaint of the exaction of an unauthorized fee from the master of the ship "Tyne," of South Shields, by the British Consular Agent at Huelva, with a view to the prevention of similar complaints in the future; and if he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House, the Correspondence which has taken place between the Foreign Office and the British Consular authorities in Spain on the subject?

MR. OTWAY, in reply, said, it appeared that the consular officer at Huelva, who was unpaid, had hitherto been in the habit of charging fees under three heads—namely, the registration of ships' papers, request of clearance, and attestation of seal and signature. These charges on a vessel amounted to about 9*s.* 3*d.* It had been decided that one of the fees was improperly levied, and the vice consul had accordingly been directed to re-fund the sum of 4*s.* 3*d.*, which had been paid to the Spanish Consul at Cadiz. He informed the hon. Member some time ago by letter that this sum was procurable at the Foreign Office any time he chose to send for it. With respect to the presentation of Papers, he was quite willing to show them to the hon. Member; but he thought it would not be right to put the public to the expense of printing Papers so very unimportant in their character.

IRELAND—LUNATICS.

QUESTION.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If his attention has been drawn to the Report of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, in which they point out the serious evil caused by the present system of indiscriminate committals by magistrates of persons as dangerous lunatics, who do not properly come under that description; and to inquire, if it is the intention of the Government at once to provide a remedy for this serious and rapidly increasing evil?

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, in reply, that the subject had not escaped his attention. He agreed with the noble Lord that the matter had become a very serious evil, as the magistrates had unfortunately been in the habit of committing lunatics, under the character of dangerous, many who did not come under that description. He had prepared a Circular, which was about to be issued to all magistrates, on the subject, and he hoped that would go far to cure the evil.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACT.

QUESTION.

MR. SAMUELSON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will introduce a Bill next Session to extend, beyond the 1st of July 1870, such modications of the Factory and Workshops Acts of 1867, more especially those relating to male young persons above the age of sixteen, as have been proved to be necessary or advantageous, but which would otherwise cease on that day; and, whether he will deal with the whole subject of the Laws relating to the employment of women, young persons, and children by a consolidating and amending Statute?

MR. BRUCE said, in reply, that the subject to which the Question of his hon. Friend referred was one which deserved most serious consideration, and very probably it would be expedient to extend the period for the modifications of the Factory and Workshops Acts of 1867. He could hardly venture to undertake to deal next Session with the whole subject of the laws relating to the employment of women, young persons, and children by a consolidating and amending statute; but he would carefully consider how the Workshops Regulation Act could be further assimilated to the factory legislation.

IRELAND—DISTRICT ASYLUMS.

QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he has any objection to state if the Irish Government in making appointments to the office of resident medical officer of district asylums will give a preference to candidates who can show that they have acquired a practical knowledge of the treatment of insanity, provided that they are in other necessary respects as fully qualified as their competitors?

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, in reply, that he did not think it advisable to lay down any absolute and sweeping rules, which generally did more harm than good; but his hon. Friend might rest assured that the Irish Government, whenever there was occasion to make such appointments, would not lose sight of the fact that practical knowledge was of the greatest importance in such cases. He had certainly never contemplated the possibility of making any such appointment without reference to that consideration.

ARMY—MILITARY LABOUR.

QUESTION.

MR. HANBURY-TRACY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If the Government have decided upon taking any, and if any, what steps for adopting an authorized organization for extending the system of military labour to military works to all stations of Her Majesty's Army; if he has any objection, in framing the Estimates for the ensuing year, to have a side-note attached to each item under Vote 14, to show whether the work is to be undertaken by military or civilian labour; and, if he has any objection, under Vote 14, to show by a foot-note what is the actual military superintendence required, in addition to the civilian superintendence at present inserted in the Estimates?

MR. CARDWELL said, in reply, that he was anxious to extend the system of military labour as far as possible, and he was in communication with the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief with reference to the necessary details. He could only say that next year he would endeavour to give as much information as possible in the shape of foot-notes to the Estimates.

ACCIDENTS IN MINES.—QUESTION.

LORD ELCHO said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department a Question, of which he had given him private notice. Some two years ago a Committee was appointed to inquire into the subject of accidents in mines, and he presumed that it was in consequence of the Report of that Committee that Government this Session brought in a Bill consisting of two parts—the first intended to prevent accidents in mines; the other dealing with the question of education, and the age at which children should be admitted into the mines. A few days ago his right hon. Friend announced that he intended to drop this Bill, so that there would be no legislation on this subject. And yet it was only in the month of June last that sixty persons were killed; and only the other day any person who opened a newspaper must have been shocked to see that between fifty and sixty men were burnt, crushed, or choked to death in a mine. Now, he wished to ask his right hon. Friend, seeing that the number of accidents was so great, and it was admitted that they could be prevented by legislation, Whether it would not be possible during the present Session to pass, at least, the preventive part of the Bill; or, if that were not possible, whether it would not be within the power of the Government, even under existing Acts, to make the Inspection of Mines more complete and efficient by increasing the number of Inspectors? If this were not done then eighteen months would elapse without any legislation being possible. He also wished to ask whether any special inquiry would be instituted into the late accident, with a view to guard against similar accidents for the future?

MR. BRUCE said, in reply, that the part of the Bill to which his noble Friend referred—that relating to accidents—was by far the largest part of the measure, and that on which most Notices of Amendment had been given, so that he had no hope of passing such a Bill during the present Session. But, moreover, he must say that while he had seen with grief the accidents to which the noble Lord referred, he must remind him that it was not to any deficiency of legislation that those accidents were to be attributed. Those accidents arose from the neglect of proper ventilation, and if inspectors were to be appointed to see that the ventilation was efficient in all our mines—especially at this dangerous season of the year—an addition of 500 inspectors would be absolutely necessary. The Government had never undertaken to inspect collieries so as to put them in a state of security. What they did was to appoint inspectors to examine the mines when there was reason to suppose they were in a state of insecurity; and it was impossible that that duty could be efficiently performed unless there was regular communication between the workmen and the inspector. He regretted to say that the existing Act had failed mainly from this want of communication. Notice of the insecure state of a mine was not given to the inspector in proper time, so that an inspection might take place. He could not, therefore, give his noble Friend any hope of an increased number of inspectors to ascertain the state of all collieries. As to a special inquiry, he had to state that an inspector was always sent down to the place where an accident happened, and if it was thought necessary that an additional inspector should be sent down in the present instance it would be done.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

RESOLUTIONS [JULY 22] REPORTED.

MR. BENTINCK: I desire to call attention to a matter personal to myself. On Saturday last there appeared in *The Times* newspaper a letter under the signature of the First Commissioner of Works in which allusion is made to me. If it was the letter of an ordinary individual I should have passed it by without notice; but coming as it does from a very high quarter, being a letter of a responsible Minister of the Crown, and of the Minister, moreover, responsible for the Department which is referred to in the letter, it is impossible for me to allow it to pass without comment. I am also guided in the course I now take by another consideration. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have always conceived that when a question arose as to a Parliamentary matter between two Members of Parliament, it ought to be decided not in the columns of a newspaper, but in the House itself in which the question arose. I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman is an accomplished writer of letters to the newspapers, but I decline to follow him into that arena; I submit that the question ought to be determined here, where, if the conduct of a Member be reviewed or criticized, he would have an opportunity of reply—in short, that the question ought to have ended where it began. I hold in my hand a copy of this letter, which the right hon. Gentleman appears to have written in order to correct a misrepresentation of a statement that he made in the House in reference to the pictures of Sir Charles Eastlake. If the right hon. Gentleman had confined himself merely to a correction of a supposed inaccuracy in the report, that would have been perfectly legitimate. But he went altogether beyond that limit in the two paragraphs of the letter which I shall now proceed to read to the House. It is addressed to the editor of *The Times*, and begins—

> "Sir,—The public probably do not take much interest in the periodical criticisms of the Member for Whitehaven upon the pictures in the National Gallery."

Passing by the question of taste whether it is a right thing or not for a responsible Minister of the Crown to speak thus of another Member of this House, and passing by the question also whether any Member has not a right to comment on the pictures in the National Gallery, I come to the question of fact; and I say that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman is incorrect in substance from first to last. I am surprised, after what occurred on Thursday night, that the right hon. Gentleman did not consult *Hansard* on this point, or, at least, did not instruct somebody else to consult *Hansard* for him. Had he done so, he would have found that since I have had the honour of a seat in this House—now for eleven Sessions of Parliament—before Thursday last I had never but once made an observation upon the pictures in the National Gallery [*A laugh.*] The right hon. Gentleman smiles. The right hon. Gentleman is not remarkable in this House, or elsewhere, for very great accuracy of statement; but I apprehend that the records of the House are well known for their accuracy in this respect. The only previous occasion on which I have made a statement in this House on the subject of the pictures in the National Gallery was in 1863, six years ago, when I addressed a question to the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. F. Peel. My question and his answer will be found in the report. In the following year I made an observation upon the National Gallery Estimate, but that referred entirely to the site of the National Gallery, and had nothing to do with any criticism of the pictures. Having disposed of that statement of the right hon. Gentleman, I go to the next. The right hon. Gentleman says—

> "Mr. Bentinck has stated that the pictures which the late Sir Charles Eastlake requested might be offered to the nation for the sum which he paid for them were sold to the representatives of the National Gallery for a very much higher price."

That was not what I stated, and my assertion on this point will be confirmed not only by those hon. Members who were present at the time, but by such other means as we possess, although not formally recognized by the House, of verifying the statements made by hon. Members. My statement was to this effect—that whereas it was currently reported that Sir Charles Eastlake had left some directions that his pictures were to come to the nation at the prices which he had paid for them, I had discovered that two pictures which Sir Charles Eastlake had bought had been sold by his representatives to the nation for a sum upwards of £2,000 in excess of that paid for them to the original owners. That was the statement which I made, and it was so reported. I hold that it was a perfectly legitimate statement to make, and the question founded upon it was a proper and pertinent question for an independent Member to address to the Government. It was to that question that the right hon. Gentleman gave his reply, and I expressed my satisfaction with that reply. But the right hon. Gentleman did more; he charged me with having spoken in severe terms in this House against the representatives of Sir Charles Eastlake. I denied that charge at the time, and I defied the right hon. Gentlemen to produce his authorities. Under these circumstances I felt it my duty to call the attention of the House to this matter, in order that I might reiterate those denials, and to submit that the public newspapers are not the proper places for questions of this kind to be discussed. It is not fit that independent Members in this House should be browbeaten and terrified by guerilla warfare in newspapers. If such a course is to be adopted by Ministers of the Crown, and hon. Members were to be afraid to get up in their places and express their true opinion upon matters under discussion, they would be unworthy of the confidence their constituents have reposed in them.

MR. LAYARD: Sir, I really do not know of what the hon. Member has to complain. He has now stated in almost the identical words I used what I said the other night. On Thursday night I stated that the observations of the hon. Member had given considerable pain to the representatives of Sir Charles Eastlake, of whom I may, to a certain extent, consider myself one. The condensed report of my speech that appeared in *The Times* newspaper gave an entirely wrong meaning to my answer to the hon. Member. The meaning attached to my answer in that report was that the pictures had been sold to the nation at an increased price over that given for them by Sir Charles Eastlake, and that I justified the transaction on the ground of the increased market value of the pictures. Being thus misreported, I thought it only just and right at once to write to *The Times*, and explain what I really did say upon that occasion. The hon. Member appears to be rather forgetful of what occurs in this House. Only last year he reminded us that the picture which he condemned, because it had been cleaned—

MR. BENTINCK: I was not present in this House last year during the discussion upon the Estimates for the National Gallery.

First Eleven Resolutions *agreed to.*

Twelfth Resolution read a second time.

MR. BLAKE, in calling attention to the fact that Scotland receives a sum of nearly £7,000 per annum more than Ireland for the promotion of her Sea Fisheries, even after making allowance for the sum returned to the Exchequer for branding fees, &c., observed that he did so with no hostile intention to Scotland or her interests; because whenever the Vote for Scotland was proposed he had always voted in favour of it; but his object was to show the gross injustice done to the fisheries of Ireland as compared with Scotland. He was glad that the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury was present to hear what he had to say; for he found it very difficult to induce him and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give a small sum of money for the Irish fisheries, whilst the prosperous Scotch fisheries got nearly £8,000 per annum more than Ireland. The sum voted for Scotland was £15,000 a year, but in the current year it was £13,298 only. Out of that sum the Treasury received back £3,500 for branding fees, leaving a sum of about £9,000. He was aware it had been said that Ireland received a larger sum than Scotland for the erection of piers and harbours; but still, even deducting the extra sum which Ireland got for the purpose, Scotland would still get £7,000 a year more than Ireland. The Scotch fisheries were in a most prosperous condition, and since the year 1800, Scotland had received £1,000,000 more than Ireland for the benefit of her fisheries. The Irish fisheries, on the contrary, were in a declining condition; and although the sum of £10,000 only would do much towards restoring them to prosperity, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had refused to give it. It was with no hostile intention to Scotland that he mentioned these circumstances, but he trusted that now that a new Fishery Board was about to be formed in Ireland, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would act — he would not say in a more generous, but in a more just spirit towards the fisheries of that country — so as to enable the trade to be put upon something like the same satisfactory footing as that of Scotland.

MR. CRAUFURD rose to move that the Vote for the Fishery Board be reduced by the sum of £5,766 13*s.* 5*d.* He did not think there was likely to be any opposition to his Motion on the ground of principle; for although he saw several Commissioners of the Board present in the House, he did not think they would come forward to uphold the Board. Anyone who had looked at the last Report of the Board could only wonder what these gentlemen could find to do. In that very Report the Commissioners speak strongly of the great benefit which the passing of the Sea Fisheries Act had conferred upon the country; and that very Act transferred the powers of the Fishery Board to the Board of Trade. Here he thought it ought to rest, and that the Board should no longer exist. A great deal had been done in the abolition of the brands that were formerly put upon fish. Long ago they had abandoned branding in the case of ling and codfish, but the branding of herrings was continued. It was thought by the fish-curers to be an advantage; and when in 1855 a Treasury Minute was passed declaring that the system of branding ought to be put an end to, the fish-curers made a stir about it, and the branding was continued on condition that the fish-curers should pay certain fees—4*d.* a barrel and 2*d.* a half-barrel—towards the expenditure. The sum received from branding and some other sources of income amounted to £4,500, and there was an annual grant of £3,000 in aid of piers and harbours; but as this rested on a statute of George IV. it was not competent for the Committee to deal with it. That grant, however, had been for some years, and would continue to be for some years more, applied to the works at Anstruther Harbour, where a great deal of last year's work had been destroyed by the severe storms of the winter. He did not see why all the harbours could not be managed like the Wick Harbour, which was supported and managed without any such external assistance at all. With regard to the herring branding, not a single brand was ever used or wanted on the West Coast of Scotland, and therefore he did not see why any officers should be kept there for branding purposes; and surely the income of £4,531 was quite sufficient to meet all the necessary expenditure on the East Coast. The Vote, therefore, might be usefully reduced by £5,766 13*s.* 5*d.*, which sum might be applied to other and more important objects. The measure of Scottish education which was now before Parliament, which he supposed would pass, would require some outlay, which, he was sorry to say, had been refused by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had dealt with the subject in a rather niggardly fashion; and the money taken from this Vote might be applied in carrying out that measure.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£9,298," and insert "£3,531 6*s.* 7*d*,"—(*Mr. Craufurd,*)—instead thereof.

MR. MACFIE said, his constituents were deeply interested in this subject, and he strongly opposed the reduction of the Vote in so far as it related to piers and harbours. In so far at least as the erection of those pier and harbour works was concerned, he contended that they were properly public works and ought not to be left in the hands of private parties. The fishermen were too poor to pay for these erections, which were the only security the State provided for the benefit of these industrious men, whose lives were frequently in great peril. He trusted, therefore, the House would pause before agreeing to the reduction of this part of the Vote—which, indeed, he thought ought to be doubled, or even trebled, rather than reduced.

MR. R. W. DUFF reminded the House that on two occasions Royal Commissions, which had been appointed to inquire into this subject of piers and harbours, had recommended that the Votes, so far from being reduced, should be augmented. His impression was, that instead of £3,000 the sum ought to be £6,000. With regard to the question of branding, he had taken some trouble to ascertain the views of those concerned on the subject, and he found that they were pretty equally divided for and against the system. With respect, however, to the Vote for the piers and harbours, there could be no doubt whatever that it was more and more than ever required. It was impossible to exaggerate the loss of life which occurred every year on the East Coast of Scotland. Considering the very small amount of public money that was given to Scotland, he was astonished to find a Scotch Member proposing to withdraw this comparatively small sum—a sum which even now was quite inadequate for the purposes to which it was applied. He was aware that some persons desired the abolition of the Fishery Board; but he should be very sorry to see that course adopted.

VISCOUNT ST. LAWRENCE complained that, while ample provision was made for the supervision and proper conducting of the Scotch fisheries, there was no such provision made for the Irish fisheries at all. In Ireland there was not a single vessel sent by the Admiralty to look after the fisheries, notwithstanding that the sending of such a vessel had been strongly recommended. When a deputation of Irish Members waited on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to advocate the necessity of a loan for the Irish fisheries, one of the principal reasons for refusing the loan was that it would tend only to promote individual interests. Looking, however, to the Returns with respect to the Scotch fisheries, which were supposed to be maintained for the benefit of the public at large, he found that, in 1863, no less than 306,822 barrels of herrings were exported to foreign parts. He trusted there would be some "levelling up" in this matter, and that a little more justice would be done to Ireland with respect to her fisheries.

MR. MILLER believed that with regard to the Fishery Board, it was the opinion of a large proportion of the Scotch Members that this institution was totally unnecessary. He certainly thought that £5,000 a year was too much to pay for mere supervision. He would beg to point out that the Vote in which the fate of the Fishery Board was involved did not affect the Vote for piers and harbours.

DR. LYON PLAYFAIR, as one of the Commissioners of 1863, reminded the House that both that and the Commission of 1867 recommended that there should be free trade in the fisheries as in other industries, and that the prohibitory Acts should be entirely abolished. That had to a great extent been done by the Acts of 1866 and 1868; and if the Motion of his hon. Friend (Mr. Craufurd) had been to the effect that, in the altered circumstances of the case, there should be a new inquiry instituted as to whether the Fishery Board should be re-constituted or abolished the Motion would have received his support; but what he proposed was that the Board should be abolished at once and without inquiry, and this he could not agree to, believing that it would throw the trade into great confusion. The interests involved in this question were very great. There were nearly £3,000,000 embarked in the trade, which gave employment to upwards of 65,000 men. Such a trade evidently required supervision, and he thought that that was performed satisfactorily by the officers of the Fishery Board. He did not say that the Fishery Board was the best way of managing the fisheries; but there must be some means applied for that purpose, and what he objected to was such a step should be proposed to be taken without inquiry. He should be glad to see a new Commission appointed to inquire into the subject; but must repeat his apprehension that, in the event of the Board being suddenly and without warning abolished, the greatest confusion and injury must ensue to the trade.

MR. M'LAREN said, he entirely approved of the sentiments which had been expressed by the hon. and learned Member for Ayr, and could not agree with the hon. and learned Member for the University of Edinburgh as to the necessity for a new inquiry, after the inquiries which had already taken place and the recommendations which previous Commissions had made on the subject. This was not an intricate matter. All that was required was to follow the principles of Free Trade—to leave the fishermen alone, as they left the ploughman alone, to do their work and sell as they pleased. The fact mentioned by the noble Lord (Viscount St. Lawrence) with respect to the amount of Scotch fish sent to foreign nations was one of the greatest compliments that could be paid to the industry of Scotland, and one of the best means of serving their common country. The main duty of the Board was to superintend the catching, picking, and branding of herrings; but surely that was not a duty to be undertaken by a Board sitting in Edinburgh. He thought the Fishery Board should be abolished root and branch, and that the duties of supervision should be left in the hands of the Board of Admiralty.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that whatever might be the merits or demerits of the Fishery Board, the Motion which had been made would only lead to confusion, and would not, if carried, really effect the object the hon. Member (Mr. Craufurd) had in view. The practical effect of carrying such a Motion would be to leave the Board without any money, and throw the whole machinery into confusion. It should not be forgotten that they were dealing with the most flourishing herring fishery in the world. Since the year 1810 it had grown in the most extraordinary manner—namely, from 90,000 barrels to 825,000 in the year 1867. During this time it had been under the management of the Fishery Board. The value of the property at stake was something over £1,000,000; and there could be no doubt that the fisheries afforded employment to large masses of the population. As regarded the matter of the brands, no doubt it was not defensible upon principles of political economy; but it should not be forgotten that this was one of the things which had grown up in the course of years, and was now so identified with the trade that the branded herring obtained the best price in the foreign market. He did not mean to say that if the system of branding was abolished the trade would not right itself in course of time. That might or might not be the case. But, in 1859, optional branding was substituted in lieu of compulsory branding, and the result was that the branding was as eagerly sought as it was before, and that the money derived from this source since the abolition had been during some years considerably in excess of what it was before. It should be remembered, too, that the services of the fishery officers were exceedingly valuable in the preservation of order among the fishermen; while, since the passing of the Sea Fisheries Act of last year, many duties had been imposed upon them which, if performed by others, would entail considerable expenditure. There could be no doubt that the harbour grant was bestowed upon works of great public utility. The small harbours of refuge along our coasts were far too few for our requirements, and indeed the subject was one which was well deserving the careful consideration of the Government. The number of lives annually lost, owing to the absence of these harbours, was not creditable either to the honour or the humanity of a great maritime country like this. But when it was said that the Board was unpopular, and that the attendance of the members was very lax, his hon. Friend would perhaps remember how totally a similar charge against the Board of Supervision of Sheriffs had collapsed. The Scotch people had a great objection to any system of centralization, and he doubted very much whether they would be content to see the duties at present performed by this Board intrusted to any body in England. He hoped, then, that the House would not consent to reduce the amount of this Vote.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, that he was so convinced of the mismanagement of these Edinburgh Boards, that he would assert that if a Committee of the Treasury were to be sent to Edinburgh in the Recess to inquire into the mode in which Scotch affairs were managed, they would find that £12,000 a year could be saved by judicious management and economy. A good deal had been said about Anstruther Harbour. He had had nothing to do with the granting of any money for the purposes of the harbour; but he was far from admitting that the money so expended had been thrown away. Indeed, he believed that the coasts of Scotland were lamentably in want of further expenditure of this nature. As to the question of branding, he did not desire do away with it if the fishermen preferred to continue the practice—what he objected to was that the public should be called on to pay for it. He thought, however, that they were better without it, and that the trade would have prospered if there had been no Fishery Board at all. Therefore, he quite supported the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for the Ayr Burghs.

Mr. LOCH said, the fact was that the brand was paid for by those for whose benefit it had been established; when, many years ago, the branding was done at the public expense, the practice was objected to as being contrary to principle. Commissions were accordingly appointed to investigate the subject; and that of 1856 reported that although the branding was indefensible in principle while paid for out of the public funds, it was desirable for the fishermen to have branding if they chose to pay for it out of their own pockets. Part of the Vote had no reference to branding at all, but to other duties imposed on the Board by Act of Parliament; and if they took away the money for paying engineers, inspectors, and other officers, the Board would be paralyzed for every purpose. If the Board was objected to, it might be abolished by Act of Parliament, but while it continued to exist and to act under the authority of Parliament, they could not consistently refuse to vote the money necessary to its existence.

Question put, "That '£9,298' stand part of the said Resolution."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 150; Noes 45: Majority 105.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. GRAVES said, he rose to call attention to the necessity for greater accuracy in the Statistical Returns for Trade and Navigation issued by the Board of Trade. His object was not to cast blame on individuals, but to improve the system. The purpose for which the Board of Trade Returns were compiled was to guide the commercial policy of the country, and to give information to those engaged in commercial transactions, and they ought, therefore, to be at least moderately accurate and speedy in their publication. It was because they were neither the one nor the other, but productive of positive mischief, that he desired to bring the matter under the notice of the House. He would first take the imports; and he would at once state that if the accuracy of his Returns were disputed he was prepared to give his authorities, and, if necessary, the names of the ships by which the articles were imported. The first article to which he would refer was that of rice. By the Board of Trade Returns for the month of January, 1868, the import was stated at 24,000cwt., while the quantity actually imported was 295,000cwt. In 1869 the Board of Trade gave the amount imported at 63,000cwt., while the actual import was 318,000cwt. He took these quantities from Messrs. Jackson and Till's circular. The next article to which he would refer was jute. In the months of January and February, 1868, the amount reported by the Board of Trade was 41,000cwt., while the actual quantity imported, according to Messrs. Barber's circular, was 248,000cwt. In 1869, the Board of Trade gave 260,000cwt., while the actual imports were 390,000cwt. He would now turn to an article of more interest connected with our home production—wool. It was essentially important, as far as possible, that accuracy should be observed in these Returns with reference to the interests of home producers and buyers. The wool imported from the East Indies in January, 1869, was stated by the Board of Trade to be 137,000lb., whereas the actual import was 1,100,000lb. In February the import was stated by the Board of Trade at 1,500,000lb., while the actual import was 800,000lb.; and in March the Board of Trade stated the import at 294,000lb., whereas the actual import was 641,000lb. Then, if he took Australian wool, which was a larger item of import, he found the quarterly returns gave this result—In the first quarter of 1868 the Board of Trade gave the import at 11,000,000lb., while the quantity actually imported was 36,000,000lb. In the second quarter the Board of Trade gave the import at 49,000,000lb., while the quantity imported was 78,000,000lb. In the third quarter the Board of Trade gave the import at 74,000,000lb., while the actual import was only 37,000,000lb.; and in the fourth quarter the Board of Trade gave the import at 20,000,000lb., while the actual import was only 7,000,000lb., according to the authority of Messrs. Bowes Brothers, the well-known woolbrokers of Liverpool. To show the practical effect of these Returns, he would refer to the circular of Messrs. Simes and Co., woolbrokers, dated June 18. These gentlemen, relying on the Government Returns, gave the official tables of imports of Australian wool for four months ending on the 30th of April, 1869, at 52,000,000lb., as against 24,000,000lb. in 1868, being an increase of 116 per cent, while the actual import was 77,000,000lb. in 1869 against 62,000,000lb. in 1868, during the same period, or only 25 per cent more. Now *The Times* of the 6th of May, referring to these Returns, said—

> "The imports of Australian wool into the United Kingdom have made a great advance this year, having amounted to the 31st of March to 34,000,000lb. as compared with 11,000,000lb. in the corresponding three months of 1868."

No wonder the brokers added—"The market was depressed, and a reduction of 1*d.* to 2*d.* per pound was submitted to." Here we have the foreign shipper and importer deceived, but the buyer is misled, and every producer of home-grown wool through the kingdom bases the value of his staple on imports which only exist in fancy. Glancing for a moment at cotton, the Board of Trade now issued two Returns—one, the Trade and Navigation Returns, the other under the Cotton Statistics Act. And what did he find? The import was 2,870,000lb. by the former, and 3,248,000lb. by the latter, or a difference of 378,000 lbs., more than one-fourth of the entire stock of the article held in this country; and this discrepancy between two official statements issued by the same Department! So much for the raw material. He would now touch on the manufactured article, and would compare the value of silk goods imported into the United Kingdom from France with the French Returns of silk goods exported from France into the United Kingdom during the three years 1865 to 1867 inclusive. The Board of Trade Returns gave the value of silk goods imported into the United Kingdom, during the three years 1865 to 1867 inclusive, at £21,355,000, while, by the French official Returns, £39,625,000, or nearly double, was given as the value of silk goods exported to the United Kingdom for the same period. The English Returns, however, did not include transhipment importations, which the French did. On the other hand, it was only fair to state that the French statistics were generally very accurate. Now, we hear much controversy about the working of the French Treaty; it is at this moment agitating the mind of the manufacturing interests of this country, and he would ask how was it possible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion on such unreliable Returns as these? The Coventry Chamber of Commerce, writing recently to the Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool, made this remark—

> "The Coventry Chamber of Commerce having reason to doubt the accuracy of the Board of Trade Returns of imports of foreign ribands, has made special inquiry into the matter, and find that the Returns are altogether unreliable. The Coventry Chamber of Commerce has reason to believe that the inaccuracy which has been found in the riband Returns exists also to a greater or less extent in the Returns of other imports not now subject to duty."

So much for the import tables. He had taken out but a few of the bulky articles, and he gave the House the result. Had time permitted him to have gone further, he had no doubt in every case the same inaccuracy would appear. He would now refer to exports, and he regretted that he could not deal so specifically with them as he could wish, owing to the unlimited character of the sources, and the difficulty of checking them without immense labour. He would therefore deal broadly with them. *The Times* of the 29th of June, in reviewing the last Returns, said—

> "The Board of Trade Returns for the past month again entirely fail to harmonize with the current complaints of commercial stagnation. The declared value of our exportations shows an increase of £1,646,505, which is equal to an increase of 11 per cent on the total of the corresponding month of last year, and 2½ per cent on that of May, 1867. Of this augmentation nearly half arises from the cotton trade, and nearly half from the iron trade. Unless, therefore, the Manchester manufacturers are steadily shipping at a loss, the adverse accounts from that city must be deceptive, or the figures of these statistical Returns are not to be relied upon."

Now, all who were sufficiently conversant with the state of trade in the manufacturing districts must be aware that the doubts thrown on the accuracy of these figures afforded the proper solution of the matter, and that so far from shippers sending their goods to raise money, they were carrying on a most cautious trade. Probably at no recent period had there been a smaller trade in exports of manufactured goods than during the last six months, and it was preposterous to talk of increased exportation. There was a general feeling that the exports of this country were greatly exaggerated to a very large extent, especially in cotton goods. Those who had studied the subject believed that there had been an exaggeration of something like £20,000,000 in a single year. If he was rightly informed, the Board of Trade had at this moment the figures which support this statement under its consideration. The weight of cotton manufactured goods which must be sent out of the country, if the yearly values were correct, exceeded the total quantity of the raw material imported, leaving nothing for home consumption. It was, however, the system on which the exports were compiled to which he desired now to call attention. By the Trade and Navigation Returns it appeared that

113,000,000 yards of cotton goods were imported into Bombay in 1867, while the actual quantity was 316,000,000 yards, or a deficiency of no less than 203,000,000 yards. Again, taking the first five months of this year, the Trade Returns gave 48,000,000 yards, while the actual shipment was 90,000,000 yards. The export of cotton cloth to Egypt in 1868 was put down at 223,000,000 yards, while the actual exports to that country were, according to the Liverpool Customs Returns, only 92,000,000 yards. He was so much puzzled by this discrepancy that he asked the two greatest shippers in the trade—Mr. Samuel Mendel and Messrs. John Pender & Co., for an explanation. The latter firm said—

> "The important difference between the figures of the Board of Trade and our own arises from the circumstance that the former enters goods shipped *viâ* overland through Egypt as for that country, although the goods are intended for India. This makes it impossible to arrive at a correct estimate of the exports to Egypt and India respectively from the Board of Trade Returns, the former country being credited for a large importation of British goods which merely pass through on their way to India."

Mr. Mendel wrote on this point—

> "For some three years I have not made use of the Board of Trade Returns, as I found them of little value for my purposes, it being necessary for me to keep up my figures of exports day by day as nearly as possible; and the Board of Trade Returns being issued about three weeks after the end of each month, they are practically useless in respect of affording early information. For Bombay you will observe my statement of exports shows them to be much in excess of those set down in the Returns by the Board of Trade—say, 43,672,798 yards more. I can only explain this large difference by supposing that all the overland exports to Bombay being indirect are set down as shipments to Egypt, as the actual exports overland will nearly make up the large difference. In this instance, therefore, the Board of Trade Returns are calculated to mislead."

It was clear that parties interested must keep these Returns for themselves, and that the Returns of the Board of Trade were worse than useless. Another cause which diminished the utility of these Returns was the absence of anything like uniformity of weight and measure in stating the imports. Ashes were given in cwts., bones in tons, bristles in pounds, indigo in cwts., zinc in tons, and tin in cwts. The exports, on the contrary, were always rendered in yards and pounds. There should be but one standard, and perhaps the cêntal, or 100lbs weight, would be the best unit to adopt. Another point which struck him was that, while the monthly Returns of the Board of Trade were inaccurate, the yearly Returns were more or less accurate, which at all events showed that the Department could do much to do away with what he was complaining of; but as the annual Returns did not appear for ten or eleven months after the close of the year, they were for all practical purposes useless to the trading community, and only valuable to the Legislature in guiding the commercial policy of the country. The monthly Returns ought to be issued almost immediately after the expiration of the month, and there would be no difficulty in so doing. The cost of these Returns was not less than £50,000 a year, and sooner or later the question would arise whether the results were at all commensurate wih the expenditure. The Board of Trade were mere compilers of these Returns, and the Customs, who really supplied them, had great difficulties to contend with in consequence of the loose and inaccurate statements made to them in regard to values by the clerks of the majority of the shippers. If a Return were made immediately on the arrival of a ship of the number of packages on board of about twenty or thirty leading articles, taken from the ship's manifest, as is done daily by the compilers of the bill of entry, the trade would soon convert the packages into quantities and measurements, and such a Return could be published two or three days after the close of the month, if not weekly, in the public newspapers, as is now done with the article of cotton. If the Returns were made at all, there ought to be in each of the great ports an officer whose sole duty should be to look after them. His own belief was that the monthly Returns might very judiciously be abolished altogether, as all purposes of reference could be satisfied by the quarterly Returns or the annual Returns. They were far too complicated, far too minute, and, in his opinion, never could be collated with the accuracy and the promptitude which alone could make these Returns worth perusal. He had made these remarks in no spirit of fault-finding, but because he wished to assist the Board of Trade in any attempts they might make during the Recess to render these Returns more useful to the trade and commerce of the country.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the subject had engaged the attention of the Board of Trade within the last few weeks, in consequence of complaints of the inaccuracy of the Returns, and especially of the monthly Returns. The Treasury, consequently, at the instance of the Board of Trade, directed an inquiry to be made, which was now going on, into the mode pursued by the Statistical Department of the Customs, by which the Returns were made. The Board of Trade did little more than edit these Returns and advise occasionally as to the particular articles to be included. The hon. Gentleman would not expect him to follow him into the various instances and items he had cited; but he must not be taken to assent to his figures or his method of comparison, because many of the complaints mixed up two things which were not the same. It was admitted that the annual accounts of the Board of Trade were in the main correct, and that the inaccuracy was principally in the monthly Returns. Last year a Bill was passed on the subject of agricultural statistics. One great reason for the apparent disparity in the Returns lay in the fact that the quantities of corn were frequently given, not according to the actual arrivals, but according to the final entries made by the importers some six weeks later. For the purposes of comparison, the difference in these two heads, taken in conjunction with the interval that elapsed, must obviously be productive of considerable difficulty. As to the importations of cotton, again; the Returns were compiled from the ship's manifest upon arrival, but the manifest did not give the actual weights; it merely gave the number of the bales which were then averaged according to the country from which they came. In comparing the Returns issued from the Customs with the Trade and Navigation Returns issued by the Board of Trade the most extraordinary variations presented themselves month by month; yet, if the aggregate Returns were compared, they would be found to correspond very closely. Thus, in the month of October, the Board of Trade Returns, as contrasted with the authorized Cotton Statistics, showed a divergence in the total quantities of over 300,000 cwt.; in the month of December of nearly 600,000 cwt.; and so on month after month; but taking an aggregate of eight months, and comparing the results of both systems at the expiration of that period, the difference in the total quantities was found to be only 68,000 cwt. or an error of less than 1 per cent. The House would probably ask why the method of calculation adopted in the case of cotton should not be generally applied? It was found, however, that although the method of obtaining information from the ship's manifest worked well in the case of certain bulky articles, it was not equally applicable to a variety of other matters, as to which the public equally desired information. The choice, therefore, lay in that case between sacrificing some convenience and advantage to the public, and incurring considerable expense in supplementing the existing Returns by other means of information. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) had also dealt with the exportation of of manufactured articles; on that point, he was himself unable to go minutely into figures, and would admit that grounds for inquiry into the accuracy of the Returns might exist, for the Department had no very reliable source of information, except the merchants themselves, who, whether through negligence or from any other motive, did not always give true and accurate returns of the goods which they exported. At the same time, these errors were apt to correct themselves; for though, if the Returns were taken in single months, they were not perhaps as reliable as could be wished for, when taken over a series of months or compared with corresponding periods, they gave a reasonably fair idea of the progress of trade. Hence, though the Returns might not be of much use to merchants in guiding their operations for commercial purposes, they did give, for Imperial purposes, a tolerably accurate view of the trade of the country. This would be apparent on comparing our returns of exports and imports with those which were collected in France. Here, where he had expected to find the greatest discrepancy, there seemed to be a tolerably close parallel between the aggregate figures, though, in many of the subdivisions there were discrepancies of an extraordinary character. In 1864, the aggregate exports of British and foreign produce to France were, according to the British Returns, of the value of £24,000,000. The French accounts made the total £27,000,000. In 1865, the English accounts represented the total exports as £25,000,000; the

French made them £28,000,000. In 1866, by the English accounts the exports were £27,000,000; and by the French accounts £30,000,000. The House therefore would perceive that as regarded exports from this country the rival figures did, to a great extent, afford materials for a satisfactory comparison. But, on looking at the imports into this country, and comparing them with the exports from France to this country, as given in the French Returns, there was a difference which he was altogether unable to account for. In 1864, the total imports as given in the English Returns, including imports for transhipment, were £29,000,000, while the French Returns made them no less than £46,000,000. In 1865, according to the English Returns they were £35,000,000, but according to the French £52,000,000; and in 1866 they were £40,000,000 according to the English Returns, but £60,000,000 according to the French. For these discrepancies he was, at present, wholly unable to account; but this would be one of the points which would form the subject of very careful investigation, and it must not be too hastily assumed that our own figures were erroneous. In the inquiry which would be instituted, and which he hoped would result in the attainment of greater accuracy in our published Returns, he should be glad to have the assistance of his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool, and of any other hon. Members who might feel interested in this matter.

MR. BAZLEY said, he had taken some trouble in investigating the Board of Trade Returns himself, and had not been able to reconcile the discrepancies. It was certainly not creditable to this country that such a system should continue, and he hoped that means would be found to remedy the defects. Whatever inaccuracies, however, there were in the monthly Returns, he believed that the ultimate results were not so inaccurate. The country ought to be able to rely implicitly on the Government Returns, and these accordingly ought to be based upon facts and not on mere imaginary conjectures.

MR. HERMON said, the thanks of the country were due to the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) for having brought forward the true state of the case in relation to these Returns. As far as trade was concerned they were totally valueless. What merchants really wanted to know was not the stock of cotton which was in the market last Friday, but what stock would be there on Friday next. Now that we were suffering as an industrial population in the North of England any fallacious statement would have a most prejudicial effect and would lead to misapprehension. No blame attached to the Board of Trade, but every week there were announcements in *The Times*, which were copied into all the other newspapers, respecting the enormous quantities of American cotton which were being sent to this country and to other parts from America. When people saw those accounts, which were never contradicted, they wondered how it was that the price of cotton could be 13*d.* a pound. The hon. Gentleman had admitted that the Returns of the Board of Trade were not useful to the commercial public, however convenient they might be for the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. CANDLISH said, the yearly statistics of the Board of Trade, which were substantially accurate, were of great use as marking our national commercial progress; but he trusted that steps would be taken to have a prompt publication of the quantities indicated in ships' manifests, for otherwise the statistics would be useless for trade purposes.

INDIA—RED SEA ROUTE TO INDIA.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he rose to draw attention to the practice of sending Naval Officers out to India *viâ* the Red Sea during the summer months, when the heat is so intense that it has been determined that Her Majesty's Military Forces shall not be subjected to it. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee which sat in 1858, a service of magnificent transports had been established for the purpose of conveying our troops to India by the Red Sea route. That sea was 1,240 miles long, was of immense depth, and throughout the greater part of its length it ran between inaccessible mountains. He need scarcely say that the heat of this trough in the summer was almost unbearable. To make matters worse, the wind for nine months in the year blew down towards the ocean, and the result was that a vessel starting from Suez, keeping pace with the wind, found herself in a calm without having a single breath of air to blow the smoke from her deck, while the heat on her deck was usually 100 deg. From continual evaporation the density of the water in the sea was one-fourth more than that of the ocean, and consequently the speed of the vessels was impeded to a considerable extent, while the heat of the surface water was usually 3 deg. above that of the atmosphere, varying, according to Captain Engledue, who had been in the service of the Peninsular and Oriental Company, from 80 deg. to 106 deg. of heat. As might be imagined, the mortality attending a six days' voyage along this sea was very great, especially during the months of June, July, August, and September. In August, 1863, eight persons were struck down in this sea by apoplexy, of whom three died. Anyone who ordered an officer to go this voyage during those months incurred a very grave responsibility, which he should be sorry to take upon himself. An hon. Member of that House, who was connected with a large commercial firm in India, had authorized him to say that no mercantile firm in India would send out an assistant in those months, except upon the greatest possible emergency. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would take the matter into his earnest consideration, and endeavour to follow, as regarded the naval officers, the course that had been already taken with respect to the officers of the Army. He had no personal acquaintance with Sir Henry Kellett, and he had only brought the question forward in the general interests of the Navy.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that he had himself been three times through the Red Sea in the hot season, and once in the month of August, and he could, therefore testify to the accuracy of his hon. Friend's statement. The interesting remarks of his hon. Friend as to the density of the water of the Red Sea should, however, have been addressed to the Peninsular and Oriental Company rather than to any Member of the Government, inasmuch as the Government had no ships in the Red Sea at the present season of the year, while the Peninsular and Oriental Company had one each way in it every week. He had to inform his hon. Friend that no such practice as that of sending naval officers out to India *viâ* the Red Sea during the summer months prevailed at the Admiralty. The custom of the Admiralty was to send naval officers out to China both in the summer and the winter months, by the long sea route. Three-fourths of the officers sent out during the last year had gone by that route. The Government transport ships between this country and India did not run in the summer months, but only during the eight cooler months, and as it was easy to manage that the reliefs should be sent out in these latter months, the Government avoided as much as possible sending out either officers or men during the four summer months. Directions had been sent to India that the authorities there should, as far as possible, avoid sending home men in the hot months. But when his hon. Friend asked him to give a pledge that under no circumstances whatever should an officer be sent by the Red Sea in the summer months he must decline to give any such pledge. It had been arranged that Sir Henry Kellett should go out by the Red Sea route and meet Sir Henry Keppel at Singapore. A departure from that arrangement would have led to much inconvenience. During the last twenty years it had been the invariable custom for the officer appointed to Sir Henry Kellett's command to go by the Red Sea route.

PARLIAMENT — DECORATION OF THE CENTRAL HALL,

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. RAIKES, in rising to move for a Committee to inquire into the circumstances under which a contract or agreement was made by the Office of Works with the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) for the decoration of the Central Hall of the Palace of Westminster, expressed his regret that he could not accede to the request made earlier in the evening by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Home Department, that he would postpone the Motion. He thought it was due to the House and to public opinion—which had lately begun to be rather interested upon that particular matter—and it was specially due to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Department into the conduct of which he wished to have some inquiry, that the matter to which his Motion referred should as soon as possible be explained. Information had now reached him to the effect that there would be no opposition to the Motion, as the Government courted the fullest inquiry, and there would, therefore, be an opportunity of the matter being fully cleared up before the close of the present Session. Under these circumstances it would be unnecessary for him to detain the House with anything like a detailed speech. He would, therefore, briefly ask hon. Gentlemen to look back to the debate which took place upon the subject of the decorations of the central hall with mosaics about a fortnight ago. That would probably still be fresh in the recollection of most hon. Gentlemen. With regard to himself, he was glad to say that he had taken no part in the debate, or in the division that took place upon it, as he was much in favour of the proposition to decorate the central hall with mosaics, and did not wish to throw any obstacles in the way of that project being carried out. The result of the discussion that took place on that occasion was to lay down the principle that, whilst public expenditure should, as a general principle, be under the control of Parliament, there were exceptions to the rule which required that certain works should be undertaken without the direct sanction of Parliament. One of these exceptions was work of a continuous character, for a portion of which a Vote had already been taken. Another exceptional case was that of a great emergency, in which it was thought desirable that with the view of avoiding injurious delay the Treasury should sanction a certain expenditure. He thought it had been pretty generally agreed, and, indeed, admitted by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Commissioner of Works himself, that the particular work now under discussion would scarcely come under either of those heads. The right hon. Gentleman had, however, made rather an appeal *ad misericordiam* to the House, and had stated that if it refused to sanction the contract which had been made for the decoration of the central hall, he must himself bear the pecuniary responsibility. It was upon that plea that the House by its Vote gave its sanction to the contract. Matters would, no doubt, have rested there had it not been for some facts which had since transpired, and which formed the grounds of the Motion which he was about to make. It was possibly known to a good many Members of the House that the company now known as the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) and to which had been entrusted the execution of the mosaics in the Central Hall, without the consent of Parliament, had been in existence for upwards of two years, part of the time under a different name. On the 2nd of January, 1867, the company was formed under the title of Salviati and Co., and first on the list of shareholders in the company was the name of Austen Henry Layard, 130, Piccadilly. At that time the capital of the company consisted of £16,000 in thirty-two shares of £500 each. Of these shares the Gentleman to whom he referred held two, and at the present time, although no shares stood in the right hon. Gentleman's name, there were two in the name of a gentleman who was, he believed, a relative or connection of his. [MR. LAYARD: No.] At all events that gentleman bore the same surname as the right hon. Gentleman. The company was, as he had said, established under the title of Salviati and Co. in January, 1867. In October, 1868, it changed its title and adopted its present name. In September, 1868, a register of shareholders was printed, which anybody could peruse who went to the registration office of joint-stock companies; and in that register he found the name of the right hon. Gentleman as the holder of two shares, and there were several other gentlemen well-known for their interest in art, and some of whom were Members of that House, also on the list. A subsequent list of shareholders was issued on the 22nd of June last—a date which seemed to bear no particular relation in point of time to the previous issue of the 10th of September, 1868—but he would make no further comment on that fact. In this last register it was stated that the right hon. Gentleman was no longer a shareholder, as his shares had been transferred, and a gentleman of the name of Thomas George Clark, of Dowlais House, near Merthyr Tydvil, was represented as a new shareholder. No special representation was made that the shares of the right hon. Gentleman had been transferred to Mr. Clark; but as the latter was the only new shareholder, and he held the same number of shares as that which the right hon. Gentleman had previously held, it was not unreasonable to conclude that the right hon. Gentleman's shares had been transferred to Mr. Clark. That transfer took place on the 10th of January in the present year, and one of the points the House should be informed upon was whether the transfer really took place on the precise date, as they knew that not unfrequently transfers were ante-dated. He did not assume that it was so in the present case, but it would be satisfactory if the House had conclusive proof that the 10th of January was really the date of that particular transfer. That being so, and the right hon. Gentleman having ceased to be a shareholder in the company since his accession to Office, but having only very recently ceased to be one, and there still being a shareholder of the name of Layard in the company, he was sure the House would conclude that it was very desirable that the right hon. Gentleman should be put in a position to assure the public that in the irregularity that took place in giving the company that contract for the decoration of the central hall, he was not influenced by the desire to benefit the company. That matter was of public interest, but no one had a deeper interest in it than the right hon. Gentleman himself. It was exceedingly unfortunate that when an irregularity like that which had undoubtedly occurred took place it should have been in connection with a company in which the right hon. Gentleman had recently been a shareholder; and he thought the right hon. Gentleman himself would admit that under the circumstances he should have exercised special caution in his dealings with the company. It might possibly be said that it was Mr. Barry who had recommended those works and advised that contract, as the architect of the building. He trusted, however, that the House would pay no attention to an explanation of that kind, which, if accepted, would strike at the very root of all ministerial responsibility, because if a Minister could defend himself by stating that such and such acts were the acts of his subordinates, it would be of very little practical use to lay any Estimates before the country at all. We had at the present moment an economical Government—a Government which had felt the importance of economy so strongly that it had increased the forces of the Treasury, and, in addition to the First Lord and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had appointed a more anomalous functionary to watch over expenditure. That being so, the country might have expected that the Treasury would have been most vigilant in looking after public expenditure, and would not have allowed a Department to run riot in this way. He had most carefully endeavoured to avoid in any way prejudging the case, and no one would be better pleased than himself if the right hon. Gentleman had a full and satisfactory explanation to give. When matters of this sort were commonly talked of out-of-doors, however, he considered it due to the credit of the House and of the Government, and especially to the fair fame of the Chief Commissioner of Works, that they should be inquired into and disposed of.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances under which a contract or agreement was made by the Office of Works with the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) for the decoration of the Central Hall of the Palace of Westminster," — (*Mr. Raikes*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. LAYARD: Sir, I have not the slightest objection to the Committee for which the hon. Gentleman moves; on the contrary, I court the fullest inquiry, both with regard to the statements which the hon. Gentleman has made here and those which, according to what he has told the House, have been made elsewhere. But, in order to facilitate the inquiry which he proposes and to enable him to obtain the fullest information, I would suggest an alteration in the words of his Motion. As I have already stated to the House no contract or agreement whatever has been made with the Office of Works, and if the Committee were to confine itself to the Instruction that it would receive, if the hon. Gentleman's

Motion is worded as it is, they could only report that such was the case. If, therefore, the hon. Gentleman will strike out the words "Office of Works" he will gain his object and secure a full and searching investigation. The agreement for carrying out some of the architectural decorations of the central hall—the only agreement hitherto entered into—was made entirely without my knowledge. The execution of this part of the decoration was one of those matters of detail connected with the designs of the architect, which I left entirely to him, and which has always been settled without consultation with the First Commissioner. What I have done my predecessors did before me. In decorating the Queen's robing room, and the crypt with mosaic, Mr. Barry was desired to select the artists whom he considered best qualified to carry out his designs. I really feel ashamed to take up the time of the House with a matter personal to myself; but I equally regret that there should be found any Member of this House who could, without inquiry and without satisfying himself that there was some foundation for these accusations, rise in his place and make such a statement as we have heard from the hon. Gentleman this evening. At least he might have delayed that statement until evidence had been taken before the Committee for which he moves, and until that Committee had made its Report to the House. He would then have had the fullest opportunity for making a statement. But that would not have suited the hon. Gentleman's purpose. He wishes the accusations he has made to go forth to the world uncontradicted before the result of any inquiry can be known. Such being the case I am compelled, although I do so with great reluctance, to make my statement to the House, in order that what has fallen from the hon. Gentleman may not pass uncontradicted, I apologize to the House for detaining it from more important business, and I promise to say what I have to say in as few words as possible. At the same time the story which I have to tell may have some little interest for the House. If any hon. Gentlemen who hear me have thought it worth while to follow my humble career they will know that I have had two passions in life—Italy and Art. Whilst Italy was struggling to conquer her independence, I spoke and worked for her in this House and elsewhere. Since she has achieved her independence I have done the little that was in my power—and it is very little—to assist in the development of her resources, and in making known the remarkable genius of her sons. With this object I have, for some years, spent the little I could spare out of my limited means in assisting struggling artists of genius and in making known their works. Some years ago I made the acquaintance of Dr. Salviati, a lawyer of Venice, and a man of great enterprize and ability. This gentleman, with the assistance of a common workman named Radi—one of those men of extraordinary artistic genius who are so frequently met with in Italy—had succeeded in restoring the art of working in enamel mosaic, which had been abandoned, if not entirely lost, for more than a century. I was greatly struck with the result of Dr. Salviati's labours, and I saw in his discoveries a source of employment for a number of poor artists of Venice, and of future wealth for their city. Moreover, I was convinced that if the art were brought to perfection it might be introduced with the greatest advantage into England. In Venice it had already been successfully employed in restoring the magnificent mosaics of St. Mark's. I did what I could to encourage Dr. Salviati, and to assist him with my advice. At the time of the Great Exhibition of 1862, Dr. Salviati came to England, in the hope of being able to introduce his mosaics into this country. The first person in England who perceived the value and importance of Dr. Salviati's discovery was the Queen, whose taste and knowledge of art are so well known to those who have had the privilege of having been brought into contact with Her Majesty. The Queen employed Dr. Salviati to decorate the groined roof and the walls of the Wolsey Chapel at Windsor, and subsequently Her Majesty approved of his mosaics for decorating the spandrils and pediments of the Memorial to the Prince Consort in Hyde Park. Dr. Salviati undertook these important commissions, and, in order to carry them out, established a school of young artists at Venice, bringing skilled workers in Roman mosaic from Rome to instruct them. Three years ago, when in Venice, I found that Dr. Salviati, although a man of genius, was, like most men of the same class, without the pecuniary means necessary to carry out his discoveries. He was in want of capital, and, having borrowed as much money as he was able, he had come to a stand-still, and was completely unable to carry out the commissions with which he had been entrusted. I was much distressed at the prospect of such great works falling through. I was distressed not only for the sake of Venice, of Italy, and of the artists who were being educated for the work, and who now depended for their livelihood upon it, but for the sake of my own country. I felt that if the magnificent decorations in mosaic of the Wolsey Chapel and the Albert Memorial were successfully carried out, a new era of art-decoration would be established in England by the introduction of a material of great beauty and durability, which would stand our climate, and would take the place, to a great extent, of fresco and wall painting, which, from various causes, does not appear to be able to resist the effects of our climate, and certainly not of the atmosphere of London. I attach probably more importance to such matters than many people, because I believe that wall decoration, properly employed, might not only tend to elevate the public taste, but might become a source of public enjoyment and public instruction. I would willingly have assisted Dr. Salviati with my purse, but my means were too limited to be of any real use to him in his difficulties; so I wrote to some friends in England who, like myself, loved Art and Italy, placed before them the circumstances of the case, and appealed to them not to allow Dr. Salviati's remarkable undertaking to fall through for want of a small sum of money. Amongst those to whom I appealed and who answered to my appeal, were, as the hon. Gentleman himself has stated, several distinguished Members of both Houses of Parliament. With their assistance the necessary funds were subscribed, and the good work was carried on. I need scarcely tell the House that these funds were furnished not with any prospect of or desire for gain, but out of a love of Art and for the sake of Venice and Italy. Owing to the assistance which he thus received Dr. Salviati was enabled to execute his commissions, with what result those who have seen the Wolsey Chapel, the mosaics of the Albert Memorial, and the beautiful reredos of Westminster Abbey, will be able to judge. Such is the history of my connection with Dr. Salviati and the company which bore his name. The hon. Gentleman has alluded to the change of that name, as if there were some mystery involved in it. The simple fact is, I believe, that it was made on account of some requirements of the Italian law in regard to what are called "anonymous societies." Since the undertaking has thus been carried on, I have taken a very lively interest in it. Every year I have myself spent two or three months in Venice, encouraging and directing the artists employed as far as I was able, furnishing them with books, drawings, and models, and endeavouring to bring this important art to the perfection which it once attained in that illustrious city. But although feeling that, whether in Office or out, I might fairly and without exposing myself to attack, take a direct interest in an undertaking of a purely artistic character, yet I know also, from bitter experience, how ready men are, in order to injure a political opponent, to make use of any little tittle-tattle, and of any calumny, even in the House of Commons. I accordingly thought it best, as soon as I came into Office, to divest myself of every direct interest in the Salviati undertaking, and I transferred my shares to a gentleman who kindly offered to take them, and who, I can assure the hon. Member, is no connection whatever of mine. I can only repeat, what indeed the hon. Gentleman himself has admitted, that the names of those who are connected with this company is a sufficient guarantee that I had not entered into the undertaking as a speculation, but solely with an earnest desire to introduce into this country a beautiful and noble kind of decoration, which might prove eminently serviceable to British Art. Almost one of the first things that was brought under my notice, after I came into Office, was the usual estimates for the completion of the decoration of the Houses of Parliament; amongst which was one for decorating the central hall. This was no new scheme. The decoration of the Houses of Parliament has been going on for many years, and has been caried out according to a scheme recommended to the House by a Royal Commission composed of some of the most distinguished statesmen of our time. That scheme has been carried out in most parts of the building, but the great hall—the very centre of and key to the whole edifice—has not hitherto been touched, having been left entirely unfinished; and yet it is the most important part of this great building, and is now in actual need of some decoration—the spaces reserved for decoration being covered with common paper, which is actually falling off the walls. Mr. Barry suggested to me that it was a proper place for the use of mosaic. The Royal Commission had recommended fresco paintings; but, after the result of the experiments in other parts of the building, I could not authorize its adoption in the central hall. I accordingly opproved of Mr. Barry's suggestion. I made no secret of the matter. On the contrary, before coming to a decision I consulted several eminent artists, those who were best able to advise me in my own Department, and many Members of this House who are well known for their taste and knowledge of Art—amongst them my noble Friend opposite (Lord Elcho). The Treasury sanctioned the expenditure, and Mr. Barry—acting as he has always been accustomed to do under my predecessors in the Office of Works—whether the system is a good one or not, I will not stop now to inquire—made preparations to carry out the work. Mr. Barry did not consider it necessary to consult further with me but went to Mr. Salviati, the son of Dr. Salviati, and made an agreement with him for executing his, Mr. Barry's, architectural ornamental designs—not for executing the picture cartoons for the vacant spaces, let it be remembered. Mr. Barry went to the person who he believed could best and most economically execute the work. It was, of course, his desire to have his own designs executed in the best possible manner, and had there been anybody better able to execute them than Salviati, he would not have gone to him. But besides the mere architectural decorations, there are four great pictures to be executed in mosaic. As I have already informed the House, I have requested two very rising young artists, Mr. Poynter and Mr. Moore, to make designs, or cartoons, as they are called, for these pictures. When these designs are made they will be confided for execution in mosaic to the artists who are most competent to do justice to them, and who can unite the best work with the greatest economy. Dr. Salviati's establishment probably best furnishes the requisite means for doing this. We need feel no jealousy of employing foreign artists. Indeed, one of my objects in assisting to introduce mosaic decoration into England has been to form, if possible, a school of English artists in mosaic. I doubt not that if this mode of decoration is found to be suitable to our climate, and is approved of by the public, and generally adopted in our ecclesiastical and secular buildings, English artists will be formed whose work will bear comparison with the best work that even Venice can produce. I can only say in conclusion, that if the hon. Member will consent to strike out the words "Office of Works" from his Motion, I shall not only be most happy to grant him the Committee, but to give him every facility for carrying out to the fullest extent its investigations.

MR. HUNT said, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman ought to feel glad that the hon. Member for Chester (Mr. Raikes) had given him the opportunity to make a most satisfactory explanation, and to clear up a matter which, in the mind of the public had not assumed a pleasant aspect. Since the subject was last under discussion there had been rumours to the prejudice of the right hon. Gentleman, and the hon. Member for Chester was justified in alluding to those rumours and in stating the facts which gave rise to them. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman had no cause to complain of any terms used by the hon. Member, for the hon. Member was careful not to assume that there was anything improper in the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman, who had now given a most satisfactory explanation of all the circumstances of his connection with Dr. Salviati. It was most desirable that in matters like these the conduct of public men should not only be free from motives of private interest, but should also be free from all suspicion of interested motives; and, after the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman, he recommended his hon. Friend not to press for the Committee.

LORD ELCHO said, he also hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press his Motion. It was satisfactory to find that the amenities of public life were such as to satisfy the House that the Motion was brought forward only for the purpose of eliciting an explanation, and he was quite satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman had cleared himself from any aspersion that might have been cast on his conduct in the matter. It was well known that the right hon. Gentleman had devoted himself for many years to the promotion of art, and had taken a prominent part in the Arundel Society, the object of which was to prevent the ancient frescoes being lost to posterity. It was the right hon. Gentleman who suggested the use of chromo-lithography to give an accurate representation of these frescoes. Any idea of a job in connection with the right hon. Gentleman holding two shares in a society, the whole capital of which was only £16,000 was absurd. The amount of the estimate was only £5,000; he would leave the House to calculate whether the amount of profit would be such as to induce a Minister of the Crown to peril his reputation, even if he were so dishonest as to think of doing so. He (Lord Elcho), taking a deep interest in the matter, thanked the right hon. Gentleman most heartily for having proposed this system of decoration, which he was convinced was better suited than any other to this country, and he was perfectly certain that the unanimous feeling of the House was that it would be a waste of time to inquire any further into the matter.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he thought the discussion had been on the whole very useful and satisfactory, and that the House ought to be thankful to the hon. Gentleman who had introduced it. When rumours were afloat affecting the character of a Member of high position in the Government the sooner the matter was explained in the House and unfounded imputations repelled the better. Such rumours and insinuations ought not to be encouraged outside the House; but when they existed it was quite right to ask those whose conduct and honour were attacked to state what were the real facts of the case. The hon. Gentleman who had brought forward the subject had been most careful not to make any attack on the right hon. Gentleman; and he considered it a happy thing for the new House of Commons to possess men who, when the conduct of a Minister of State was impugned, would not hesitate in a becoming spirit to ask for an explanation. When properly put to the test such mischievous rumours would not travel. The explanation appeared to be perfectly satisfactory, and therefore he felt confident that the hon. Member opposite would not press his Motion for a Committee.

Mr. SCOURFIELD said, he was perfectly well acquainted with the person to whom the shares of the right hon. Gentleman had been transferred. He was in no way connected with the right hon. Gentleman, and he was not a person likely to take shares in any company, except in a *bonâ fide* way for the advancement of art.

Mr. RAIKES begged to assure the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Commissioner of Works that if he had used any expression which was offensive or unfair he was exceedingly sorry for it. He thought, however, that the matter ought to be sifted because the rumours were very prevalent. He was quite satisfied with the explanation; and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not be sorry that the opportunity of making it had been afforded to him.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—MAJOR M'GUIRE'S CAMPING SYSTEM.—MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. KNIGHT said, he rose to call attention to Major M'Guire's Camping System, and to move an Address for Copies of all Reports and Correspondence on the subject, from the first Report by Lord W. Paulett in 1864 to the present date. The blanket hammock consisted of a blanket hung upon two light sticks, which raised the man when sleeping in it 10 inches from the ground. It had been tried on campaign and favourable reports were made of it. He had seen a great many letters from commanding officers who spoke of it in the highest terms. Gentlemen high on the medical staff also spoke favourably of it. Lord William Paulett, when commanding at Portsmouth in 1864, made an exceedingly favourable report of the system; but they all knew how difficult it was to induce any public Department to move in a matter of this kind. He begged therefore to ask whether Government had any intention of adopting the system in the service, and if not, why not?

Colonel ANNESLEY seconded the Motion. He was surprised that the system had not attracted more attention. Some of the best qualified judges had spoken highly of the merits of the invention. The chief diseases which were found to devastate a camp were camp fever, dysentery and diarrhœa, and pulmonary affections; most of them were actually generated by the continued exposure of sleeping on the ground, and all were undoubtedly greatly aggravated by that hitherto inevitable evil. In July, August, and September, 1854, the British Army in the Crimea lost at the rate of 293 men out of every 1,000 per annum—96 per cent of this loss was from disease. During the next three months—October, November, and December, 1854—their loss was at the rate of 511 out of every 1,000, seven-eighths of which loss was by disease. In January, 1855, it was at the rate of 1,174 per 1,000 per annum, 97 per cent of this loss being due to disease. During the first three months of that year it was at the rate of 912 per 1,000, and 98 per cent of this loss was due to disease. These figures were quite appalling, and if any of the men thus lost could have been saved by such an invention as this it was surely the interest of the War Office to adopt it. It was perfectly well understood what was the great cause of this enormous mortality. A letter from Captain Gordon, dated Balaklava, December 3, 1855, stated that every exertion was made during the Crimean War to obtain straw and other material for filling the palliasses, but nothing suitable to the wants of the whole Army could be found. He would also read an extract from *The Times*' Correspondent's letters—

> "Before Sebastopol, Jan. 2, 1855.
>
> "I cannot conceive much greater hardships than those to which men in the trenches are subject when, at the end of twelve hours' watch, they return half-cramped and frozen to their damp, cheerless tents. . . . It is an actual truth that our force is deprived day by day of the services of 100 men in every twenty-four hours."

Again—

> "Jan. 19, 1855.
>
> " . . . I know of regimental hospitals in the front, where the sick men, in wet marquees, have now only one blanket to lie upon—on the ground —at this very date."

He wished to direct the attention of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India to the question. The Secretary of State for India had estimated the expense of the Army of India at £16,000,000 per annum, and there was a loss per annum of £388,000 attributable to diseases which were preventible. Colonel Hort, of the 36th Regiment, wrote to Captain M'Guire as follows:—

> "As I have been upwards of five-and-twenty years in the service, and was all through the Eastern Expedition — besides having knocked about a great deal under canvass in India—I ought to have a certain amount of experience in camping, and I have no hesitation in saying that keeping the body free from contact with the ground is one of the most important considerations in preserving health during service in the field. I hope to see every soldier ordered under canvass provided with one of your blanket hammocks—which he can perfectly easily carry on his pack—feeling satisfied that it will save many a fine fellow from hospital, invaliding, and even the grave. I believe lying on the damp ground has done more to fill our hospitals, when on service, than probably any other cause."

Colonel Valentine Baker, commanding the 10th Hussars, an officer twenty years in the service, whom he had himself met at the Cape, during the Caffre War of 1851, reported that—

> "September 27, 1865.
>
> "An experimental tent, with ten hammocks complete, was received from Captain M'Guire on the 2nd instant, and ten old soldiers of the regiment were detailed to occupy it, and have done so up to the present period."

Colonel Baker added—

> "I beg to say that I consider the hammock a great improvement, being conducive to the health and comfort of the men; and the occupants of the tent, who are old soldiers, accustomed to tent life in India and the Crimea, are unanimous in their approval."

The next testimony in their favour was from Lieutenant General Sir James York Scarlett, commanding the division at Aldershot, who said—

> "I have the honour to attach true extracts from the reports of commanding and other officers who have had under trial the hammocks and tents of Captain M'Guire's pattern, for the information of his Royal Highness the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, from which it will be seen that both officers and men are unanimous in their approval of the invention. I have myself inspected and tried these hammocks, and I fully concur in the opinions expressed in the accompanying reports. The difficulty appears to be the additional weight to be carried, as the field blanket weighs 3lb. 12oz., while the hammock, staves, and pins weigh 6lb. 8oz. In standing camps, or when transport was available, these hammocks could not fail to be beneficial to the health of the troops, as the men would never be required to sleep on the ground, and the issue of straw would be done away with."

He showed the hammock and tent to a medical officer of his own regiment—Mr. Turner, assistant surgeon to the Scots Fusilier Guards—who had been in the Crimea, and he said—

> "Had this invention been discovered before the troops landed in the Crimea, what a boon it would have been, not only to the men, but also, I might say, to the surgeons, who might have then looked for some good results to remedies which, for a patient lying on wet soil, could have very little effect."

Lord Napier of Magdala was strongly in its favour, and telegraphed for 1,500 hammocks for the Abyssinian Epedition. Mr. Fawcett, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General, Abyssinian Expedition, reported—

> "From its lightness and portability it makes an excellent sick carriage, and was almost the only one in use for the sick and wounded on our return from Magdala, many of whom I heard speak in high terms of its ease and comfort."

The Times' Correspondent, writing from Senafé, and describing the vigorous measures taken to reduce the baggage, &c., to the minimum, said—

> "After a hard morning's work, the carriage was cut down to the extent mentioned. . . . . By substituting M'Guire's hammocks, which weigh only 8lb. each, for the heavy 'dhoolie' (hospital bed) ordinarily used, two 'dhoolie wallahs' were given the work of six. This shows a saving of 300 per cent in an item of land carriage in one of the most difficult countries ever traversed by British troops."

As we had 64,000 British troops in India, many of whom necessarily often camped out, the matter was one of great importance. He thought that, after these reports, the military authorities and the War Office would be blameable if they sent out any field force in future without at least hospital marquees supplied with this camping system.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of all Reports and Correspondence on the subject of Major M'Guire's Camping System, from the first Report by Lord W. Paulett, in 1864, to the present date,"—(*Mr. Knight,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, the Government would produce the Papers on this subject with pleasure. They had not formed any intention of adopting this particular method of curing or attempting to cure the evils which the hon. and gallant Member had referred to. The Papers would show that the balance of authoritative testimony was rather against than for the particular system which the hon. and gallant Member advocated. It was true that Lord Napier of Magdala had expressed himself in its favour, but the Commander-in-Chief in India, Sir William Mansfield, was against it, and the Government of India had not seen its way to adopting it.

Major General Sir PERCY HERBERT regretted the very unsatisfactory character of the reply made by the Under Secretary of State for India, and said, that if the Government waited until every officer in the service agreed in the merits of an invention of this kind, they might wait till the day of judgment before any improvement was adopted. When a soldier like Lord Napier of Magdala spoke so highly of this invention, and when the Governments of Madras and Bombay were favourable to it, the Home Government should not allow the service to lose the benefit because one officer in high command was not quite satisfied about its merits, and because the Government of Bengal was jealous of the Governments of Madras and Bombay. The want which this invention supplied was one of the greatest experienced by an army in the field. In ordinary cases, in India, mattresses stuffed with cotton were carried for the troops, and when the ground was damp, these mattresses became saturated with moisture. The only objection to this invention was that it was a little heavier than the blanket which the men ordinarily carried on their shoulders in European warfare. But in many cases, the troops were encamped in one place for long periods, and in these cases the weight was of little or no consequence. In the Crimea the men had to wade for a long time ankle-deep in half-frozen mud, upon which they had to put their blankets. Of course, they died in great numbers, and as one of the doctors said—"What was the use of medicines, when the men had to sleep on such beds?" The Government sent out plank floors for the tents, but it was difficult to get them up to the troops, on account of their weight and cumbrousness; and, when they did, some of the soldiers used them for firewood. The practical difficulty of getting men to sleep off the ground when encamped had been got over more successfully by this invention than by anything that had ever before been offered to the service. The opinion of those who had seen it in operation was almost overwhelming in its favour. The practice among European armies was to supply them with straw, which the men plaited into mats. The expense and difficulty of collecting the straw for this purpose was enormous. Lord Panmure sent a telegram to the Crimea, directing the Commissariat to supply the whole army with straw, to keep the men off the ground. Captain Gordon thereupon represented that the quantity of straw necessary to supply the troops with palliasses once a month would exceed all that the tonnage of the vessels in the Black Sea could supply. He trusted that the Government would re-consider their decision on the subject.

MR. WHEELHOUSE said, that from time to time he had been brought into contact with hundreds of soldiers discharged, on account of disease, who attributed the commencement of it to the fact that they had been obliged to sleep upon the ground at night. He hoped the matter would now be thoroughly looked into and investigated.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—QUESTION.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, his object in pressing the Question, of which he had given notice to the President of the Board of Trade, was to bring before the House and the public in a prominent manner the names of those railway companies who had treated with indifference or contempt the circular recently issued by the Board of Trade, in consequence of the large number of accidents which had occurred. The history of a period of four months during the present year, covered by the last Report from the Board of Trade, would alone justify very stringent measures. That Report showed that 10 out of 15 accidents had arisen from collisions. The Government Inspector, Colonel Yolland, had reported that the managers of railway companies were perfectly aware that the public were subjected under the present system to risks which were capable of being very greatly reduced; yet, lacking either the will or the power to adopt the necessary precautions, they allowed matters to continue in the same way. Since the official Report was issued a collision occurred on the 11th of June, which it was distinctly shown would not have occurred had the line been worked on the telegraph and block system. In other cases railway companies were shown to have abandoned the attempt to enforce an interval of time between trains, and had not substituted any interval of distance. The collision at New Cross, where 100 persons were injured, and one death happened, had occurred since the official Report was issued, as had also the collision with an excursion train near Castle Howard, and a further collision on the 6th of July, only four miles from the scene of the awful Abergele accident. In the hope that Government would persevere in the effort to enforce upon railway companies a due regard of human life, he would beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, If he has taken any further steps with regard to his Circular to the Railway Companies upon the block system, in consequence of the accidents which have occurred within the last few weeks; if any Answers have been received from the different Railway Companies to that Circular; and whether, if he has received such Answers, he will lay them upon the Table of the House?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that with the permission of the House, he would answer the Question. To the circular sent out by the Board of Trade replies had been received from about three-fifths of the railway companies. These detailed the various systems in use upon their lines, and in cases where the block and telegraph system was not used the reasons for adopting a different course were stated. About two-fifths of the railway companies, however, had not complied with the circular at all, and to these, in consequence of recent reports which had reached that Department, he had felt it his duty to issue another circular, calling attention to the circular previously forwarded, and begging that the information required might at once be supplied. He hoped to receive answers from these different companies before the end of the Session, and in that case he should lay upon the table of the House a selection from those answers, so that hon. Members and the public might be able to judge of the validity of the reasons which were advanced.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £191,950, to complete the sum for Public Education in Ireland.

MR. MAGUIRE: Sir, I did expect that my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland would have made a statement to the Committee, and that the usual annual Report would have been issued ere this. But as that Report has not been laid on the table, I must, of necessity, rely on the facts and figures of previous Reports in support of the appeal which I now have to make in behalf of one of the most useful and important bodies of men in Ireland, the teachers of the national system of education. I can assure you, Sir, that the condition of the national teachers has excited the deepest sympathy of the Irish Members — of Members not only from all parts of Ireland, but of all parties. I am personally aware, from having my name placed on the Paper in connection with this question, that many hon. Friends of mine, not here at present, watched the progress of the Estimates with the greatest anxiety, to see when this Vote would come on; and being compelled to leave for home, they authorized me to speak in their name in behalf of the object I have in view. Happily, Sir, the question of the condition of the teachers is one which does not involve or provoke the least controversy or dispute; it does not, above all, involve any question as to the principle on which the system is based. Hon. Gentlemen who hold the most extreme views on the two opposite systems—that of mixed and that of denominational education — join harmoniously in the desire to improve the education given, whatever may be its principle, and thus render it as advantageous as possible to the country. Sir, whatever the educational system may be — be it mixed or be it denominational — it is impossible that it can be successful in its objects if the teaching staff be not thoroughly efficient, and therefore thoroughly contented. The working of any system does not depend so much upon its administration, or on its principal officials, however able the one or however intelligent and zealous the other may be; its main success depends upon its teaching staff — the rank and file of its organization. Then the question directly comes, in what condition do we find the national teachers of Ireland? In what state is that vast army of progress on which depends the teaching and improvement of the youth of the Irish nation? I regret to say that that condition is miserable in the extreme, such as to excite the deepest compassion in the minds of those who are familiar with it, and even to inspire no little alarm for the consequences to which, if not altered for the better, it must inevitably lead. The condition of teachers of the youth of Ireland may be summed up in a few simple words—they are badly paid, badly clad, badly housed, badly fed, with no comfort in the present, and no prospect for the future. That is their position at this moment; that has been their position for many years. And, Sir, it is with the object of improving that condition, that now, at this late period of the Session, I bring their case before the House of Commons. I do so not so much for their sake—though no one feels their miserable plight more keenly than I do—I do it mainly on national grounds, and for the benefit of the people for whom this system of education was intended. In order to understand their position at the present moment, I go back a little, and show what was the notion formed some four-and-thirty years since as to what ought to be the remuneration of the teacher under the National Board. In the year 1835 the Commissioners were of opinion that the minimum salary of the teacher ought to be £30 a year, with free apartments. Remember, that was their idea some four - and - thirty years since — when provisions were cheaper, when every necessary of life was cheaper than at the present day—that £30 a year with free apartments, was the lowest provision that should be made for the instructor of youth. The object of the Commissioners was a wise one — to ensure the respectability and comfort of the teacher—to raise him in the estimation not only of his pupils, but their parents—to give him influence in the circle in which he moved — and, above all, to render him contented with his position, and on that account more efficient in the discharge of his duty. Here is an extract from what was written in 1835 by the guardians of a then infant institution—

> "It is only through such persons that we can hope to render the national system successful in improving the general condition of the people. It is not, however, merely through the schools committed to their charge that the beneficial effects of their influence would be felt. Living in friendly habits with the people; not greatly elevated above them, but so provided for as to be able to maintain a respectable station; trained to good habits; identified in interest with the State, and therefore anxious to promote a spirit of obedience to lawful authority, we are confident that they would prove a body of the utmost value and importance in promoting civilization and peace."

Let us now see in what manner this idea has been realized. In the year 1867, the remuneration of the teacher was as I shall state. The average salary of the ordinary national school teachers of Ireland, excluding model school teachers, work mistresses, and paid monitors, was as follows:—From the State a little over £26 per annum, and from all other school sources a little under £7, making a grand total of £33 a year, or 12*s.* 8*d.* a week. This may be called the maximum average. But there is something much worse. There were then about 5,000 national teachers, whose income from all sources was at the rate of 8*s.* 5*d.* a week. Take the two sums, and strike an average, and what have we as the average salary of the teachers of the youth of Ireland? Something more than 10*s.* a week, or less than 1*s.* 8*d.* a day. 10*s.* a week and no free apartments—no house—no cottage—no accommodation of any kind. This matter of house accommodation involves a very great grievance, to which special notice ought to be directed. As a rule, there is no house attached to the national schools; and the teacher has to find such accommodation as the district and his means can furnish him; thus he has to rent a house or apartments at a terrible sacrifice of his scanty means, or he has to put up with the most miserable accommodation in a peasant's cabin, much to his own discomfort, and to the loss of that influence which a person in his position and holding his office ought to exercise. We know how wretched is the accommodation in the cabins of the Irish peasantry—two rooms at most, and one of those the sleeping chamber of the entire family. And here, with the entire family, the poor teacher is often found, sharing in their wretched accommodation. It frequently happens that the teacher has to walk two or three miles to and from his school every day in the week. I myself know instances where the distance each way is four miles, five miles, six miles, and even seven miles. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derry (Mr. Serjeant Dowse) told me of a case in his part of the country where a teacher walked six miles to his school and six miles from it. An hon. Friend near me the Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan), has just informed me of an exactly similar case. My hon. Friend the Member for my own county (Mr. Downing) has a similar one to tell; and I know of a still stronger one—that of a teacher who belongs to the city of Cork, from which he walks every morning to the national school of Cloghroe, a distance of seven miles, and to which he returns every evening. Only imagine, fourteen miles a day, almost sufficient labour of itself! But what a preparation for his important duties in the morning; what a fearful addition to the wearying drudgery of the day! Suppose an unfortunate teacher drenched to the skin during his walk of two or three miles, and in what humour can he be for undertaking his onerous duties to his pupils? Now, Sir, not only do I desire to see the teacher properly paid and properly housed, but I am most anxious that, at least in rural districts, he should have a garden, say of an acre in extent; and I am anxious for this arrangement for several reasons. Ours is an agricultural country; and, in my judgment, elementary teaching of the great industry of the country is a matter of primary and even essential importance. I would have this garden not only for the exercise and recreation of the teacher, and for the supply of necessary vegetables, but for the teaching of his pupils the rudimentary principles of agriculture. A house and garden in every rural parish might be had at a cost of from

£100 and £120; and I am strongly of opinion no more useful outlay could be made for the practical advantage of Ireland. Then, Sir, we have the teachers of the youth of the Irish nation in this miserable plight, without house accommodation, such as was originally contemplated, and with a pittance in many instances little above the ordinary wages of an agricultural labourer, and in many instances below what the man receives who merely toils with the spade or the shovel. Surely such a state of things ought not to be allowed to endure a year longer. Its toleration is cruel to the individual, injurious to the community, and fatal to the system. As a simple fact, and in no spirit of exaggeration, I assert that there is no people in Europe who exceed the Irish in their love of learning, and in their respect for the possessor of knowledge. But how is it possible that this feeling can withstand the influence of poverty and misery, when associated with this learning and knowledge, in the person of a badly clad and badly fed national teacher? Raised above the people intellectually, he is degraded below them socially by his poverty and privation. On this shamefully inadequate income he has to keep up an appearance of decency becoming his position as a teacher of youth; but there are not a few instances in which the dress of the unhappy man is an object of pity or of ridicule. It may be thought that the amount supplied from local or voluntary sources is smaller than it should be. But I warn the Government on this head. The amount from all local sources, whether in the shape of endowment or school fees, was £52,000 in 1867. Possibly it was somewhat higher than this in 1868. I warn my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department against straining these voluntary resources, especially the school fees, and for a very obvious reason. If you do so, you run the chance of diminishing the attendance of children whose parents are very poor. As it is, the attendance is not satisfactory, and requires to be explained. There were on the roll, in 1867, some 900,000 pupils; but of this number only about 330,000 were in actual daily attendance — little more than 35 per cent, or one-third of the whole. If you compel the children in the poorer districts to pay even the smallest sum, you risk this attendance, small as it undoubtedly is. In the schools of the Christian Brothers in my city the attendance is about 80 or 85 per cent, while in the national schools it is but 35. This is a very serious matter, and requires caution in its treatment. What will hon. Gentlemen think when I tell them that it frequently happens that the teacher is asked, is even compelled, to pay the rent of the school-house? In the Report, I believe, of 1867, there are 294 cases of this kind admitted. The average payment is a little over £2; and I have heard of an instance of so much as £6 a year being paid by a teacher in the shape of rent; this was for the school at O'Brien's Bridge, county Clare. Teachers are likewise compelled, in many instances, to provide furniture and apparatus for their schools out of their wretched salaries. Of course, this is not the rule but the exception; still such a state of things should never be suffered to exist. There is then another, and, in my mind, a very serious grievance, which demands redress. I refer to the arbitrary power of removal or dismissal on the part of the managers. I know this power is exercised on the whole with clemency and prudence—nay, with consideration and generosity; but I have heard of instances in which it has been exercised harshly and capriciously. As matters now stand the manager can dismiss the teacher at a moment's notice. I had almost said with a moment's notice. I know of cases where teachers have been re-placed without notice; for instance, of a teacher coming to his school on the Monday morning and finding his successor in his place. I have known this happen to female as well as male teachers. Now, what I would suggest would be that fair notice of the cause of complaint should be given to the teacher, and that an investigation should be held, so that an end might be put to arbitrary dismissal—in other words, the power of flinging a teacher helpless and destitute on the world. And as to a matter of the very last importance — there should be some provision for the teacher in his old age. According to the existing rules, this just principle is admitted, but is most inadequately carried out. Suppose a teacher has spent twenty-four years in the service of the Board, is broken down through old age and infirmity, and is compelled to give up his occupation, the Commissioners may afford him a gratuity at the rate of a month's pay for every year, or a total of two years' pay for twenty-four years' service. Now a man may be unfit for work, especially the work of teaching and conducting a school, but he may linger on for ten years, or even longer; and after this pittance is exhausted, what resource has he but the charity of his friends or the refuge of the workhouse? And, as one of the Board's Inspectors remarks, the workhouse is a poor prospect for any man. It is a cheerless prospect for a man who has led a life of hard privation; and this is the life which the great body of the national teachers of Ireland have hitherto led. What the teachers justly demand is a pension, to be obtained after fair service to the public. Now, the giving of this pension would not involve any serious cost. With £9,000, in addition to the sum granted annually in the shape of retiring gratuities — a sum equal to £4,500 — pensions might be provided for deserving teachers. The certainty of having this provision in old age or infirmity would be of enormous service to the system as well as to individuals. It is true all are not paid in the miserable manner to which I have referred; but those who are better circumstanced are but a small minority. About 400 have the advantage of good service salaries, and some enjoy a higher average than the £33, which is the average of the salary of the ordinary teacher; but the average pay of the great body of classed teachers—now about 8,500 — is little more than 10*s.* a week, and that is scandalously insufficient. It drags down the unhappy man, whose mind should be free from sordid care, by the heavy pressure of daily and hourly want. Let us now see how this state of things operates. It drives a certain class from the public service, and it renders the rest discontented. The ambitious are ever on the look out for a change, to be had in other occupations, or in emigration to the States or our own colonies. But bear in mind that the most efficient leave—those whom the State has trained at great cost—those whose retirement is a grievous loss to the education of the country. This annual desertion, equal to 11 per cent, is a loss which no amount of false economy can compensate for. Better to pay these men well, and secure to them the certainty of pensions in their declining years, than to train them at great cost and trouble, and lose them afterwards when they are trained and serviceable. This is a proposition which I put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who can appreciate its force. This evil strikes at the very life of the system, robs the State of its best servants, and enormously deteriorates the character of the general education of the country. I am happy to say none have been more earnest in their sympathy, or more urgent in their remonstrances, than the officers of the Board, its head Inspectors and district Inspectors. To fortify my statement, it is absolutely necessary that I should quote a few passages from the Reports of gentlemen who speak with such authority. Now, Sir, I will bring down the proof to the present hour, even to this month of July, to show how this evil is practically working. At a meeting of the Ballina Board of Guardians, held on the 5th of July, 1869, the following letter was received from the district Inspector, who had been asked to recommend a competent teacher, the guardians being willing to give an increased scale of remuneration:—

> "Francis Street, Ballina, 2nd July, 1869.
>
> "Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 1st instant, in which, on the part of the Guardians of the Ballina Poor Law Union, you request me to recommend a classed male teacher for the vacant workhouse school, I regret to be under the necessity of informing you that, so far as I am aware, no such teacher is to be had in my district. Very many schools are closed for want of teachers, and many more are in charge of unclassed, or in other words incompetent teachers. I beg to suggest that you should advertise in other than local newspapers.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
>
> "JOHN E. WOOD, District Inspector, N.S."

The *Tyrawley Herald* of the 8th remarks—

> "It is not difficult to account for this state of things. The teacher's profession has ceased to be attractive to any considerable number of the population. Under the National Board it no longer holds out an inducement to persons of information and talents in any walk of life to enter it. The truth is, the rewards it offers are scarcely superior to those lying before the day labourer, while the toil is as great, and the anxiety and the wear and tear bear no comparison. In a pecuniary point of view the position of the mechanic is far superior to that of the national schoolmaster."

The evil fruit of this miserable payment to the most important of your public servants — the teachers of the youth of a nation — these who are powerful for good, and could be potent for mischief—is manifold desertion, loss, inferior teaching, and deep-seated discontent. As a body, the national teachers of Ireland, men and women, are entitled to the greatest admiration; for, notwithstanding their temptations, the temptations of poverty and discontent, they are the advocates of law and order, and the promoters of ideas of industry, and progress, and morality. The Commissioners, who appreciate the importance of the rank and file being contented, desire to pay them well, and are anxious that Parliament should enable them to do so. This is what I desire of Parliament. It is true a Royal Commission is sitting in Dublin; but that does not lessen or take away the duty of the representatives of the Irish people to say what they know to be right, and just, and wise, in a matter of grave public moment. This is a question which does not brook delay—it cannot with safety be delayed a year longer. I know that it is too late to do anything practical this year; but I call on the Government to be prepared to deal with this one branch of the question in their Estimates next year. I am far from saying that the officers of the Board are overpaid. Far from it. I believe the salary of the Resident Commissioner — one of the most accomplished men in Europe —to be unequal to his position. Neither are the Inspectors overpaid; but the teachers are badly paid out of all proportion. There are two gatekeepers in Marlborough Street, in Dublin, paid 16*s*. 6*d*. a week each. They only open a mere gate of timber or iron; but the teacher, who opens the door of the human mind to the light of knowledge, would esteem himself happy had he been paid at the same rate. Sir, I make my appeal to Parliament, not merely in the name and on behalf of some 12,000 teachers, the very life of the educational system of my country, but in the name of the best interests of that country, which may be retarded or promoted according to the character of its education, and the efficiency and success of its teachers.

Mr. SYNAN observed that the grievances of the teachers referred to by his hon. Friend were four-fold. They complained, first, of their salaries, next, that they had no residences, thirdly, that they had no pensions or superannuation allowances, and fourthly, that the managers had an arbitrary power. This latter point would require delicate handling; but it could not be doubted that the teachers were miserably paid. About 3,000 of those teachers, men and women, were paid on an average £18 a year each, which was supplemented by school fees amounting to £4, so that their entire remuneration was £22 a year, out of which many of them had to support families. The salaries received by the teachers were not higher than the wages of common labourers, and it was this that was striking at the root of the system; for the number of teachers fell off so largely in 1862 that £300,000, which had been expended in training them, was lost to the State. Of course, people in England who dealt with the Consolidated Fund spoke of the enormous sum voted for Irish education; but let it be remembered that a Bill had just passed by means of which the Consolidated Fund would be relieved of the payment of £70,000 a year for the *Regium Donum* and the grant to Maynooth. He would suggest that this money, gained by the Treasury at the expense of Ireland, should be applied in supplementing the salaries of Irish teachers and raising them, as it would do, from £33 to £50 a year, an advance which would satisfy the teachers themselves. The want of residences compelled teachers to walk six or seven miles to school, and the same distance back; and it ought to be made obligatory in lay patrons of non-vested schools to provide residences as a condition of their receiving assistance. But nearly all the schools were in the hands of clerical managers, who had not houses for themselves, and could not be expected to provide them for teachers. If the Government would aid the clerical patrons, he believed the people would do their part in remedying the grievance. The absence of any provision for superannuation involved melancholy results. A gratuity equal to a year's salary was given for every twelve years' service. In his own county a teacher was invalided and received £35; he recovered, and the Commissioners, when asked to put him at the head of a school, declined to do so unless he would re-fund the gratuity. The man was almost a fit subject for a workhouse, and might as well have been asked to pay the National Debt. If the Government would give £70,000 to supplement the salaries, he believed the people would tax themselves to provide superannuation allowances. As to the power of dismissal, nearly all these schools were in the hands of clerical managers, who had popularized the system in the country, and, if they were arrayed against the system, by being deprived of the power of dismissal, that would prevent the system being established. If, however, the other grievance were remedied, he believed this of dismissal, which was a sentimental one, would not occasion any serious difficulty, because cases of dismissal were not of frequent occurrence.

SIR FREDERICK W. HEYGATE said, he had pleasure in confirming what the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) had said, and in supporting the appeal he had made on behalf of a deserving class of men. What they had to consider was whether the payment of the teachers was in proportion to the payment of all other classes. Irish Members must have been struck with the numbers of applications made to them for their patronage on behalf of Irish teachers who wished to leave the duties for which they had been trained for the excise, the customs, or the constabulary. During the short time the late Government was in power he was overwhelmed with such applications. All this indicated how inadequate the payments of the teachers were. Looking at the increased cost of living, the advanced pay of the constabulary, and the contiguity of Ireland to this country, there was no doubt that great injustice was done to the teachers. It was true that the Consolidated Fund had been relieved of £80,000 or perhaps nearly £100,000 a year, and it would simply be doing justice to a deserving class, and not merely making a gift to Ireland, to apply the money in raising these salaries. Wet or dry they had to go, and their labour was unceasing. He thought, therefore, that the least they could do was to increase their small pittance and give them a fair and equitable scale of salary. Again, they were almost the only class of public servants in Ireland who were not entitled to superannuation allowances. He trusted that the Government would remember that England and Ireland were not separated now as they used to be; that they would bear in mind that those in one country were perfectly aware of the rates of payment made in the other, and that they would take this case into consideration. If nothing were done, he should himself next Session bring forward a Motion on the subject.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he wished to add that a great source of complaint was the fact that the payments were made every three months instead of every month, the adoption of that course frequently leading to serious embarrassment.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) began his statement by something like a complaint that he (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) had not made a general statement in respect to the present condition of Irish education. [MR. MAGUIRE: No, no!] No change had taken place that year in the working of that system. The whole system of primary education in Ireland was under inquiry by a Royal Commission. He acknowledged that both the Mover and the Seconder of the Motion had done real service, not only to the national school teachers and national school system of Ireland, but to the people of that country generally. He was quite prepared to admit that the national school teachers of Ireland were underpaid. Considering the vast influence these men exercised—all the greater on account of the absence from many parts of Ireland of men of education—considering the amount of good they did, and considering the amount of evil they could and he was afraid sometimes did do, it was of enormous importance that the House should take care these men had reason to be contented with their position, and well-affected towards that which was best for the interests of the country. Having, however, admitted that these men were not paid as they ought to be, he felt bound to point out one peculiarity in their position and in the position of the system of national education in Ireland which it was impossible to overlook in considering this question, and that was the inadequate amount derived in Ireland from local support and local contributions. He knew that Ireland was a poor country, and he was not one of those who felt disposed to exact from Ireland more than the country was capable of performing, but still the contrast between the local support given to education in Ireland and in the other parts of Great Britain was in itself sufficient to excite the deepest regret. In this country of the whole amount of the emoluments of the school teachers two-thirds were contributed from local sources, the State furnishing only one-third. In Ireland, however, the support of the school teachers was almost entirely defrayed by the State—the whole amount of local subscriptions not rising above some £12,000 a year, and the whole amount of the school pence not exceeding £45,000 a year. The number of pounds subscribed in Ireland towards this great object did not much exceed the number of masters required to support it. Having said that, with the hope that the local proprietors might be induced to contribute more largely, he was quite prepared to admit that the amount of contributions furnished by the State had not reached its full extent. The allusion made by his hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan) to the Irish Church Bill was not the first as it probably would not be the last of its kind. He was not prepared to deny the soundness of the plea for liberality to the national school teachers of Ireland, and there was no doubt that the subject was one for future consideration. But he would remind the Committee that the national schools of Ireland were not schools of the State. Schools like these, the teachers of which were locally governed, locally appointed, and locally dismissed, had strong claims upon that local support which was so willingly extended in the case of the schools in this country. Having, however, admitted the claim of these teachers to increased support, both from local sources and from the State, respecting not only their salaries but the improvement of their residences, it only remained for him to point out that at that moment nothing could be done by the Government beyond recognizing the necessity of improvement. His hon. Friend had said he did not know whether the Royal Commissioners would investigate that particular branch of the subject. All he could say was that if they did not they would, in his opinion, fail in duly performing their duty. But in any case the Government would deem it their duty, whether assisted by the Commission or not, to look closely into the matter, and he earnestly trusted that no great length of time would elapse before some means were devised for improving the condition of this important and valuable class of men.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART said, that they could never expect to get teachers of a high character as long as the business of teaching was made a sort of refuge for the destitute.

Dr. BALL said, he thought that, as a Royal Commission composed of men of great weight and authority had been appointed to investigate not only the abstract question of the mode of national education to be adopted, but the position of the teachers, it was premature to discuss their claims at present. He, for one, was not disposed to take for certain statements made with respect to that position, even when made in speeches in that House, and it was, in his opinion, far preferable that the Government should defer coming to any conclusion on the subject until they had the facts of the case before them in a shape which would scarcely admit of doubt. It was impossible that the whole question should not engage their attention after the Report of the Commission had been received. If the Commission had not been issued he should, probably, support the view taken by those who contended that the pay of the teachers should be raised.

Mr. G. H. MOORE said, he thought the statement of his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland was satisfactory, so far as the inadequacy of the pay of the teachers was concerned; but, when he stated that the local contributions in aid of the national school system were very inadequate, he seemed to forget that that system was one which the Irish people disapproved. It followed almost as a corollary from that fact that the Government had to support it themselves.

Mr. SHERLOCK said, the simple fact that there were 5,000 teachers in Ireland receiving only 8*s.* 6*d.* a week in the shape of remuneration, or less than the wages of an unskilled labourer, was quite sufficient to justify the hon. Member (Mr. Maguire) in calling the attention of the House to the subject.

Mr. DOWNING said, he could fully corroborate the statements of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire), as to the position in which the national school teachers in Ireland were placed. There was no question, he would add, on which the Irish Members were so fully agreed as the necessity of bettering that position. He was glad to hear from the Chief Secretary for Ireland the admission that the school teachers were ill-paid, and that their case would be inquired into.

MR. LEFROY said, if his right hon. Friend and Colleague (Dr. Ball) had as much experience in the House as many of the hon. Gentlemen who had now addressed it, he would know how vain it was to protest against the discussion of any subject because it had been committed to a Royal Commission. He agreed it might be better to wait for their Report. At the same time he would not object to the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork, provided the masters were well-conducted and qualified for their situations; but it should not be forgotten, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had admitted, that some of them had acted most discreditably. His chief object in rising was to observe upon the marked difference between the debate that evening and those that had been held in former years, when the discussion was not as to a few shillings more or less to a good schoolmaster, but upon the principles of the education which was supported by the grant given by this House. On this night all appeared to agree, as on a late more important and, he would add, more unfortunate occasion. Nevertheless, he felt it his duty to interrupt that unanimity of opinion, so far as to express the hope which he had never failed to express when that Estimate had been brought forward; and he trusted that the Royal Commission would recommend that the Protestant laymen and clergymen of Ireland should have assistance in teaching on those principles which they considered the only sound and safe foundation for any useful national instruction. He would not hesitate to state his opinion that the Holy Scriptures alone were that sound basis. The exclusion of them by that House had been the cause of that limited local subscription to education which the right hon. Gentleman had truly said existed in Ireland. Such was not the case in the Church Education Society, where the Scriptures were taught; it was that want that had made our national system so defective and, while he admitted the display of great numbers on the list, rendered the benefits derived by those numbers very limited. Holy Scriptures were admitted by our greatest public men to be all-important for sound teaching, and he again hoped the Royal Commission would recommend a greater support and encouragement to that system the most becoming a Christian legislation. If so, he should not object to see some of the large sums now at the disposal of the House devoted to this object.

MR. MAGUIRE said, that the Report of the Commission would embrace a very wide subject, of which the payment of teachers formed only a part; and while the general question of Irish education might be postponed for a time, the point now under discussion must be settled at once. With reference to the statement that the local contributions had been very small, it ought not to be forgotten that the Catholics had built many of the schools, and thus furnished a gigantic contribution to the gross amount raised. In conclusion, the hon. Gentleman expressed himself quite satisfied with the statement of the Chief Secretary.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £530, to complete the sum for the Education Commissioners' Office (Ireland).

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £18,196, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

MR. BLAKE said, he wished to call attention to the enormous sum of £23,246 required to pay the salaries of the Officers of the Board of Works in Ireland, and the imperfect state in which the accounts must be kept, notwithstanding the expenditure of £5,624 per annum on the Accountant's branch alone, proved, amongst other things, by the fact that a Return for the expenditure on the small Department of the Sea Fisheries was not furnished for a fortnight after it was ordered by the House, and the non-compliance with the provisions of the Act 5 & 6 *Vic.*, c. 106, s. 112, which direct account of receipts and expenditure in each year to be furnished with the Annual Report on the Fisheries to the Lord Lieutenant. He could point out certain discrepancies and inaccuracies in the accounts of the Irish Board of Works, in one item of which there was a mistake of £27,000; there was also great waste of public money for the salaries and expenses of that Department. Although there was little or no work for a solicitor, the Board charged £1,500 per annum for a solicitor and £400 for his clerks, while he (Mr. Blake) believed that any attorney in Dublin would be glad to perform all the work that had to be done for £200 a year. In the architect's branch there was now very little to be done beyond the erection of lunatic asylums, but the charge was £800 a year for an architect, and £300 for an assistant architect and draftsman. There was also £600 a year for an engineer and £300 for an assistant; but their work was almost confined to the erection of fishery weirs and harbours—the work of the Board in reference to arterial drainage being now performed by other bodies—and he knew from his own experience that the work was very inadequately performed. People who called at the office of the Board were treated with the greatest *hauteur*. Another instance of the extravagant management of the Board was connected with the late visit to Ireland of the Prince of Wales. On the occasion of the Prince's investiture with the order of St. Patrick, £6,400 was expended in temporarily fitting up St. Patrick's Cathedral for the ceremony, but of that large sum the amount returned for materials afterwards sold was only £250. In conclusion, he contended that £20,000 of that Vote might be easily saved, and the work of the Department more satisfactorily performed. The hon. Member then moved that the Vote be reduced by £3,587, being the salaries of the chairman, commissioner, the accountant, and the chief book-keeper.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,609, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."—(*Mr. Blake.*)

Colonel FRENCH said, he concurred generally in what had fallen from his hon. Friend (Mr. Blake), except as to the alleged want of courtesy on the part of the officials of the Board. He had himself last Session expressed his objection to the government of Ireland being placed in the hands of irresponsible Boards, and had called attention to certain advances made by the Irish Board of Works upon insufficient security. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer took the matter into consideration, and was obliged to admit that the security on which the money had been lent was totally inadequate to pay either principal or interest. He was anxious not to trespass further on the time of the Committee than was absolutely necessary to show that the Government ought not to trust any further business to the Commissioners of Public Works, considering what had happened since the original formation of that Board. It must be recollected that though there was some communication between the Treasury and the Board of Works, there was no appeal from the latter. The Board of Works had been twice brought under the notice of Parliament—once upon a Motion by Lord Monteagle in the House of Lords, and a second time before a Committee of the House of Commons, of which he had the honour to be Chairman. It appeared when the matter was brought before the House of Lords that the Board of Works could give no satisfactory account of the arterial drainage which had been executed by their officers. They had themselves made the plans and drawn up the estimates, and all the works had been executed by their own officers. In most cases they had to ask for an additional sum of money very nearly equal to the original estimate of the cost. The House of Lords reported to the effect that they could not admit against the resources of Ireland the sum claimed by the Board of Works; and that the arterial drainage which had been so mismanaged should be executed according to the orignal plan, and at an expense not exceeding the original estimate. The Board of Works undertook to carry out the award of the House of Lords, but they did not do so; they merely skinned over the matter. Then in their Annual Report they stated that a sum of money which could not be recovered under their management had been forgiven by the people of England. But that was unfair and untrue. The

Irish counties had paid everything, and more than they ought to have paid. He did not see on what grounds the Board of Public Works was entitled to the confidence of the public or the people of Ireland. They had been employed also on certain lunatic asylums, and the manner in which they had executed the work had given ground for serious complaint. They ran up the expenditure to something close on the amount which the Chancellor of the Exchequer derived from Ireland in the shape of income tax, and the asylums were badly built after all. Under all the circumstances, it was not unreasonable to ask the Government to consider this matter with a view to retrenchment.

COLONEL SYKES said, that a more important question than the reduction of the Estimate was the charge preferred against the Treasury by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake), of having made false Returns to the House. If the printed statements of the Government were not to be trusted, by what were Members to be guided. He insisted it was the duty of the Government to dismiss from the public service those clerks with whom the faulty Returns originated.

MR. AYRTON said, he was extremely obliged to the hon. Members for Waterford (Mr. Blake) and Roscommon (Colonel French) for having set so good and novel an example in the way of economy as they had done, in asking for the reduction of an Irish Vote. But he was bound to say that the Board of Works in Ireland had most important duties to discharge; it had to look over a very large amount of expenditure of varied character throughout the country, and it consequently required a large establishment. No increase had been made in the charges for that establishment, beyond what length of service justified; and not to vote the salaries of the heads of the Department would be to put an end to the Board altogether, and render many Acts of Parliament, —which could only operate through the heads of the Board—entirely useless for the time being. He did not suppose his hon. Friend meant more by this Motion than to call the attention of the Government to what appeared to be an excessive expenditure. He would be glad to go through the details of the Vote with the hon. Member, and be thankful for any suggestions offered by Irish Members. The head of the Board he knew to be a gentleman of considerable ability and discretion, certainly worthy of the confidence reposed in him: but it, of course, did not follow that a Board long established would not be the better for review. The remarks of the hon. and gallant Member for Roscommon had reference to everything done in the House during the last thirty years, with regard to works in Ireland. The Board of Works could not be responsible for the things he complained of, because, in every case, it was but the instrument of the Government of the day.

COLONEL SYKES observed that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) had not alluded to the erroneous Returns.

MR. AYRTON stated that the Returns were framed on figures calculated from a certain basis: the hon. Member (Mr. Blake) made his calculations on another basis—hence the discrepancy.

COLONEL SYKES submitted that the hon. Gentleman should inquire into the subject.

MR. AYRTON: Certainly.

MR. BLAKE said, he would gladly accept the offer of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) to go over the accounts with him; and he believed he could show that a saving of £20,000 a year might be made. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would allow him, out of every £10,000 saved, £1,000 for the Irish sea fisheries. The Board cost the country 3*s.* 4*d.* for every 20*s.* it spent in public works—a state of things without parallel in England.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

TELEGRAPH (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton.*)

[BILL 233.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. W. FOWLER said, he rose to call attention to the terms of the agreements made with the telegraph companies, and to the sums proposed to be given to the companies in pursuance of those agreements. The noble Marquess the Postmaster General thought this a more convenient opportunity than the second reading to go into the agreements, and that was the reason why he made no observations on the occasion of the second reading. As the House knew, by the Act of last Session, it was left with Parliament in this Session to vote or not vote the money required to purchase the telegraphs. On this point it was worth while reading a section of the Preamble of the present Bill, which was as follows:—

> "And whereas by the said Act it is provided that in case no Act be passed in that or the next Session of Parliament, putting at the disposal of the Postmaster General such monies as may be requisite for carrying into effect the objects and purposes of the said Act, the provisions contained therein or in the agreements thereby confirmed relating to the arrangements with railways and telegraph companies, and all proceedings thereunder, should become void; and the Postmaster General is required in that event to pay to the several companies therein mentioned all reasonable costs and expenses incurred by them in relation to any proceedings under the said Act."

He therefore maintained that there would be no breach of the contract with the telegraph companies or the railway companies if the House came to the conclusion that it would not vote any money on this occasion. He objected to the arrangements made, because the basis of the agreements with the telegraph companies was a wrong and improvident one, that basis being that the Government was to give the companies twenty years' purchase for their business; and he was able to quote the authority of Members of the Government for that proposition. Last year the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) said—

> "Putting aside the admission of the proprietors themselves—that telegraph property was liable to constant depreciation—there was not a business of any kind in the country yielding a profit of 15 per cent that was worth twenty years' purchase. A business that yielded only 5 or 6 per cent might command twenty-five years' purchase; but to give twenty years' purchase for a business that yielded 15 per cent was most improvident."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 1575.]

And the right hon. Gentleman now at the head of the Admiralty (Mr. Childers) said last year—

> "There really was no evidence that twenty years' purchase was a fair price, and the mode in which the price had been fixed in this case would be a bad precedent. The Government should not have fixed upon any number of years' purchase, but should have inserted in the Bill the usual compensation clause, and allowed the price to be fixed as it was in all analogous cases."—[*Ibid.* 1597.]

The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Poor Law Board also said last year—

> "He would ask, was it a proper way to go about the purchase—that they were content to give any amount that could be afforded without actual loss irrespective of the actual value? He knew it might be said that the property was worth holding, and that if we got what we wanted we need not mind the terms. Why should we begrudge the giving a handsome sum to the telegraph companies, if we were to do so without loss to the country? But, he would ask, was that the proper thing for Parliament to do?"—[*Ibid.* 1574.]

He would answer that it was not; and, if it was not a proper thing for Parliament to do, two things would naturally happen—we should find that the sums to be given to the companies in arbitration, on the basis fixed by the Act of last year, would appear to be very large, having regard to the paid capital of those companies, and we should also find that the shares would rise in the market to an extent unprecedented in the history of any ordinary speculation. He was prepared to show that both these things had happened. The amounts awarded were so preposterously large, and the rise in the value of the shares had been so enormous, that the House would allow him to quote the figures. In January, 1867, the £100 shares of the Electric and International Telegraph Company stood at 132; in January, 1868, they were worth 153; the intentions of the Government were known in November, 1867, the agreement was signed in July, 1868, and in July, 1869, the shares had risen to 255. In January, 1867, the £5 shares of the United Kingdom Company stood at 1½; in January, 1868, they were at 2¾; and in July, 1869, they were quoted at 6½ to 7. At the same periods the £5 shares of the London and Provincial Telegraph Company were quoted at 1½, 2¼, and 3¼; and the £100 shares of the British and Irish Magnetic Company had risen from 90 to 115 and upwards. The most remarkable instance of all was furnished by Reuter's Telegraph Company. In April, 1868, £25 shares were at 9 to 7 discount; in July, 1868, at the time of the agreement, they stood at 5 to 6 premium; after the agreement was signed they were at 31 premium; and in July, 1869, they were at 45 premium, so that £25 shares had risen from being worth £16 to be worth £70. These figures showed that the market value of shares had risen in a most remarkable manner. What was the effect upon the valuations arrived at by arbitration? The Electric and International Company was to receive £2,900,000, although the whole amount of the capital and debenture debt of the company was £1,240,000. The capital of the British and Irish Magnetic Company was £534,000, and it was to receive £1,243,000. The capital of Reuter's Company was £266,000, and it was to receive £726,000. The capital of the United Kingdom Company was £350,000, and it was to receive £562,000; and the unfortunate London and Provincial Company was to receive £60,000 for £65,000. These figures in themselves furnished sufficient reason for bringing the matter before the House. He did not say they were conclusive; but they called for some explanation from the Government. As a loyal supporter of the Government, he wished to vote for the Bill if he could; but he must ask the House whether the agreements were such that they should be allowed to become precedents. The Water Supply Commission suggested that the Government would have to buy up all the water companies; and, if so, the companies would be anxious to use this case as a precedent. Therefore, it was important the House should express an opinion as to these improvident agreements. He did not concur with those who objected to monopoly, for he thought the Government might rightly perform a function; but they ought not to enter into business, and, therefore, it was right and proper they should have full control as they had in the case of letters. It did not follow from that that it was right to give anything that anybody chose to ask. He understood the Electric Company had not power to pay more than 10 per cent without reducing its charges, and he could not conceive how a concern could be entitled to twenty years' purchase, when there was an actual limit to the amount of dividend which it could divide. The noble Marquess had stated that he had settled with the railway companies; but he understood on good authority that there were large bills in reserve. Some of the most important agreements were short in duration; that with the Midland Company would expire in five years, and it was said that at the end of the five years all the posts and wires on the line of the Midland Company would be the property of that company. Therefore, for what the House knew there might be contingent liabilities for hundreds of thousands or millions more. What would it have cost to have started with a bran-new set of wires and posts? The right hon. Member for the City of London cross-examined the witnesses on the subject last year; and as the result he said in the debate—

> "The witnesses estimated their assets at £2,200,000, and it was admitted that if the Government were able to start fair, and begin the system for themselves, the wires could be constructed for less than £2,000,000. They were, therefore, about to pay £4,000,000 more for the good-will, for the buying-up of interests, and he might say, for the eagerness to do the thing in a hurry."

That was the language of one of Her Majesty's Ministers, and he hoped, therefore, that the House would pause before taking what might justly be called "a leap in the dark." He admitted that, with fairer terms of purchase, the Government had facilities for conducting this business, but, as it was, he had far rather that the whole thing should come to an end than make such a bargain as was proposed. No doubt the present Government were placed in a difficult position by the conditional arrangement entered into by their predecessors in Office, and if the late Government had made it known that they would only give what the business was worth they might have made a better bargain. If a railway company wanted to take a piece of land, they took it at its market value, with 10 or 20 per cent added for compulsory purchase; and it was upon that basis that the business of the telegraph companies should have been valued. Now, what was the business of such a company worth? An hon. Member on the opposite side told him he should be glad to sell his business at five years' purchase; the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Morley) said he should be glad to sell his for ten years' purchase; and the firm with which he (Mr. W. Fowler) was connected would be glad to get ten years' purchase. A telegraphic business was peculiarly hazardous and speculative and he did not believe it was worth more than ten years' purchase. With 25 per cent added for compulsory sale this would make 12½ years' purchase, and, therefore, the country was losing 7½ years' purchase, or £2,000,000 upon the bargain made. Why should this amount be taken out of the pockets of tax-payers to enrich people who were well able to take care of themselves? He hoped the House would not give the extravagant and outrageous amount which was proposed in the Bill, but even supposing that the Bill passed, it should not be regarded as a precedent for future legislation.

Mr. R. TORRENS said, he thought that the Bill should be referred back to the Select Committee, whose Report had only been published that morning. That might be regarded as tantamount to the rejection of the Bill, and he was prepared to accept that position, feeling that it was better to reject the Bill than squander so much public money. Should the Bill fall to the ground a large sum must, no doubt, be paid to the companies with which contracts had been made; but this compensation could not, upon any reasonable estimate, exceed £500,000, and it would be better to suffer this loss than give £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 at the outset and incur a heavy annual loss besides, as he felt sure would be the result of this measure. It must be remembered that when the subject was introduced late last Session, it was on the distinct understanding that the question was to be left wholly open for the future consideration of Parliament. The Government were not pledged, and no person was in any way, either legally or morally, fettered in dealing with the question. Now, the original estimate of Mr. Scudamore was that the plant and good-will of the telegraphs could be purchased, at the outside, for £2,400,000, and he proposed that another £100,000 should be laid out in extensions, making the total £2,500,000. His calculation of profits, even upon that fair and reasonable outlay, was based on the supposition that 11,200,000 telegrams would be annually sent. But how did he arrive at that supposition? By taking the example of Belgium and Switzerland, and arguing that the proportion existing in those countries between the number of letters and telegrams annually sent might be made to exist here. In England the postage was a 1*d.*, and the proposed rate for telegrams 1*s.*, so that as 2 were to 5 in Belgium, 1 was to 12 in England. That was the method by which the number of 11,000,000 telegrams to produce 11,000,000 shillings was arrived at. The estimate, however, both with regard to income and expenditure, was altogether untenable, and other calculations had been made which would bear the test of examination even less. Mr. Scudamore estimated the cost of maintaining and repairing the lines at £130,000 a year, and the expense of management at £326,000 a year. The £130,000 a year would give about 3*d.* for each telegram, and with 7*d.* for management, the total would amount to 10*d.*, which added to 6*d.* for the proportion of interest on the £7,000,000 which each telegram would have to bear, made 1*s.* 4*d.* Mr. Scudamore, in the more favourable estimates which he brought forward, gave a profit of £100,000 a year to the Government; but it must be remembered that instead of £2,500,000 being paid for the good-will and plant of the telegraph and railway companies, £6,000,000 odd was to be paid, and the total amount to be raised for the expenditure was £7,000,000, instead of the £3,000,000 originally proposed. It was now estimated that instead of 11,000,000 telegrams there would be only 8,000,000, so that while the expenditure had been trebled, the source of income had been diminished by one-fourth; and still the noble Marquess (the Postmaster General) estimated the Government profit at £82,000 a year, or only £20,000 a year less than was given by Mr. Scudamore's calculation. The estimates, which were so contradictory as to be absolutely irreconcilable, ought to be investigated by a Select Committee before Parliament was called upon to sanction so great an outlay. Mr. Scudamore stated that the £130,000 for the maintenance and repair of the lines was not an estimate at all, but the actual cost incurred by the four companies which it was first proposed to buy up. Now, however, there were not four but six companies to be bought up, and yet the estimate for maintenance and repairs was reduced to £103,000. That might be easily accounted for by the fact that the companies, expecting to be bought up, had lately abstained from making any such outlay, and they would have a strong inducement to apply to capital what ought to have been taken out of income to keep the lines in proper order. Previous to the prospect of being bought up, four companies spent £130,000 a year in maintenance and repairs; but since the prospect had arisen, six companies had only paid at the rate of £103,000 a year. It was said that the estimate of income and expenditure had been verified by the experience of the Electric and International Company; but it was not taken into consideration that the Electric and International Company had not reduced their charges to 1*s*., and had not extended their lines into unprofitable districts as the Government proposed to do, in order to give the best accommodation to the public. Then there were some great omissions from the items of expenditure as now set forth. In the Act of last Session there was an extraordinary clause, which provided that compensation in the shape of pension or retiring allowance should be paid to all the servants of the companies. Mr. Scudamore stated very distinctly that the compensation to be paid to officers of the company should not be made by the buyers, but by the sellers; but in this Bill it was provided that that compensation should not be paid by those who got these enormous sums out of the public purse, but by the Government, and the additional charge created in that way had not been taken into account by the noble Marquess. The working expenses put down by Mr. Scudamore at 7*d*. for each telegram, were put down by the noble Marquess at £191,000 on 8,800,000 telegrams, or at 5*d*. on each; but when it was considered that the cost of each Savings Bank transaction was exactly 7*d*., it was not unreasonable to suppose that Mr. Scudamore's calculation was much nearer the mark than that of the noble Marquess. But the estimate of 8,800,000 telegrams would not bear any examination whatever. The estimate was arrived at in this way—It was said that, according to the rate at which the telegraphic business had been increasing for the last few years, the number of telegrams, by the time the Government took up the business, would amount to 6,240,000 and an increase of 40 per cent was then added to that, on the ground of the extra accommodation which would be afforded to the public, and on the ground of the increased cheapness in the price of the message. But on examination it would be found that the 6*d*. messages in the metropolitan district would be raised to 1*s*., or just doubled in price, and that a falling off of only 25 per cent was allowed for it, while the 1*s*. 6*d*. messages would be lowered to 1*s*., or reduced by only one-third in price, and that an increase of 30 per cent was estimated upon that. He believed that the most sanguine calculations that could be made in this matter would be that 7,000,000 telegrams, at the very outside, might be anticipated at the uniform rate of 1*s*., involving a charge of 8*d*. on each telegram. The working expenses being 7*d*., and the cost of maintenance 4*d*., the whole would be 1*s*. 7*d*.; but it was proposed to work for 1*s*. 2*d*. There would, therefore, certainly be a loss on each telegram of 5*d*., instead of a gain to meet contingencies. If he did not fear to weary the House he could show many more cases in which the estimate was entirely erroneous. He would only mention that there was an item in the accounts relating to the Atlantic and European Telegraph passing through this country. That charge was 1*s*. 6*d*., and it was proposed to reduce it to 1*s*., although the French cable would be brought into competition, and would cut off a source of the present revenue. He regretted that he could not afford the Government his support in this measure. He hoped that the whole subject would be referred to the Select Committee. ["Move!"] Well, he would move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee, with a view to the further examination of the Estimates.

MR. WHITE seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee, to examine and take evidence upon the Contracts entered into with the several Telegraphic, Railway, and Canal Companies, with a view to determine whether they are of the character of fraudulent or of improvident Contracts contemplated in the Resolution of this House of the 24th day of July 1860; and to examine the calculations upon which the Estimates of Receipt and Expenditure, as set forth in the Reports of Mr. Scudamore and in the Statement of the Postmaster General when submitting Resolutions upon this subject, are based, with a view to determine whether there is any reasonable prospect that said Estimates may be realized,"—(*Mr. Robert Torrens,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. W. H. SMITH did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down into the various statements he had made; but being a director of one of the telegraph companies he could give some information to the House on the subject of telegraphs which it was desirable hon. Members should possess. In 1868 the companies were by no means desirous to part with their property, but the question whether the Government should be in possession of the telegraphs having been forced on their consideration, the three principal companies very reluctantly came to an arrangement with the Government of the day. He did not wish to express any opinion on the bargain which had been made, and would only say for himself and those with whom he was associated that they very deeply regretted to be obliged to part with property which had been profitable, and which they had great pleasure in managing. In 1862 the net earnings or profit of the Electric and International Telegraph Company were £67,363; in 1863, £89,630; in 1864, £102,906; in 1865, £127,075; in 1866, £133,502; in 1867, £145,725; and in 1868, £171,843. In consequence of the increase of revenue the Government would only pay sixteen instead of twenty years' purchase. He had only, therefore, to repeat that so far as his company were concerned they were extremely sorry to part with their property, which had been so productive, and which they had reason to believe had been conducted with some advantage to the public. Exception had been taken to the figures of the Postmaster General as to the expenditure of telegraph companies. The present receipts of the three principal companies amounted to £585,127, and their expenditure to £343,260, leaving a net profit of £240,000. By amalgamation there would be an economy of at least 40 per cent on the actual working expenses of the companies, so that of the present expenditure, £343,260, for maintenance and cost of clerks, it would not be an excessive estimate to say that the Post Office would save £137,000. No doubt there must be some deductions from this on account of wires carried into places where they did not now exist; but still there would be great economy from the fact that the Post Office and the Post Office clerks would in these cases be used. He wished to express no opinion on the general subject; he only wished to state to the House facts which it was well they should know with regard to the value of the large property in question.

Mr. HUNT said, he did not wish to interpose for any long time between the House and the Bill, but as the bargain made by the late Government had been criticized it might be considered hardly respectful to the House if he did not say a few words. The question of the bargain made had been very fully discussed last year, but the two hon. Gentlemen who had to-night spoken against the Bill were not then Members of the House, and he was only afraid he might repeat what he then said. The hon. Member below the Gangway (Mr. R. Torrens) had stated that the Bill of last year was brought in at a late period of the Session; but that was not an accurate statement. The Bill had been introduced on the 1st of April. It was true it had not been discussed till a late period of the Session but it was laid on the table to give Members a full opportunity of making up their minds and also on account of the negotiations which were going on a long time with the different telegraphic companies. Subsequently, when the discussion came on, great obstruction was made to the passing of the Bill—not on account of any strong objection to the principle of the Bill, but because Members then on the Opposition side of the House were not desirous that the late Government should pass it. ["No, no!"] He believed that this was the state of the case, but he, for one, was willing to let bygones be bygones. Objection was now taken to the term of twenty years' purchase being adopted as the basis of the agreement, and it was said that this was extravagant. By the Act of 1844, which gave the Government the option of purchasing the railways after a certain interval, it was provided that the Government should give them twenty-five years' purchase of the profits. So that the agreement of last year with the telegraph companies gave them five years' purchase less than the sum which Parliament thought fit to provide should be given by the Government for the railways. The question then was, whether the terms should be left to arbitration or whether they should be based on so many years' purchase of the property. The original proposal was by arbitration, and as soon as that was known the shares began to rise immediately. It was not difficult to account for this rise in price. In the first place, this was the first time the business of the telegraph companies had been subject to Government investigation, and after this investigation the holders of shares became more satisfied in regard to the value of their property, and therefore the price to purchasers was considerably enhanced. In the next place the proposal was to buy up the whole of these undertakings, and this raised the price far more than if a few haphazard purchasers had gone into the market to buy only a few shares. It was not until very late in the Session that the late Government agreed to purchase the telegraphs on the terms then agreed upon. The first calculation of the Government was that they ought to take eighteen years' profits as the basis of purchase. The companies, on the other hand, stood out for twenty-five years; but eventually a compromise was come to, and it was agreed to take twenty years. The hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. W. Fowler) said that he should be glad to sell his business for ten years' purchase of profits; but in this case the Government bought the plant of the companies as well as their good-will, and he did not know whether there was any great value in the hon. Member's plant. The companies not only sold their business, but they gave up the hope of carrying it on in any other form or direction. The late Government had to consider whether the companies were not carrying on business at an increasing rate of profit. The time of the year was one considerable element in the calculation, because it was clear that if the Government and the companies did not come to an agreement the Bill must be dropped for the Session. It was said —"Well, let it drop, and if a satisfactory arrangement is come to another Bill can be carried next Session." The Government had to consider whether it was more economical to agree to the terms proposed or to drop the Bill. He came to the conclusion, for which he was responsible, that if the Bill were postponed the Government would have to give this Session a far larger sum than that which they would give on the then basis of twenty years. This view of the question was confirmed by the noble Marquess the other night, when he said that although the Government agreed to give twenty years' purchase last year, they were now really buying the telegraphs at seventeen and a-half years' purchase, on account of the increase in the profits during the last year. This probability was brought under his consideration, and had very considerably influenced him in the course he adopted. He admitted that the Government were about to give very liberal terms to the companies, but they were bound to do so. The sale was a compulsory one. The companies did not want to part with their property, while the Government and the public very much desired to buy it. He believed that the undertaking would answer in the hands of the Government, and they now heard that the telegraphs would bring in a net profit of £77,000 a year to the Post Office—a sum which would be largely increased every year, according to the increase of business. Last year the Government made the best bargain they could for the public, being convinced from what was said, both in the Press and in Parliament, that it was desired the telegraphs should be transferred to the Post Office. He believed that if the House now assented to the agreement they would be making a very good investment on the part of the public.

MR. CRAWFORD denied that Members sitting on his side of the House, who had opposed the arrangement last year, had been actuated by any feeling of jealousy. The late Government should have the credit of carrying the measure. He had not the good fortune to be a shareholder in any of the telegraph companies, but the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) had given the House some useful information in regard to the company with which he was honourably connected as a director, and if they had been supplied with similar information from each of the other companies the House would have been in a better position to form an accurate judgment on this subject.

The magnitude of the sums to be given for profit had hardly been fully realized. The Electric and International were to receive as profit £1,200,827; the British and Irish Magnetic, £277,596; and the United Kingdom, £370,000—the profit being calculated as the difference between the sum given by the Government and the shares and stock valued at the market prices of June, 1868. But the sum given to Reuter's Company as profits far exceeded these. The capital of that company was £250,000, and the shares of £25 each, upon which £24 had been paid, were quoted at £22 10*s*. The sum given to that company as profit was £501,000, or 200 per cent., and he found it impossible to understand the process by which that sum was arrived at. The matter was referred for arbitration to the Recorder of London, in whom he felt the greatest confidence, nor did he doubt that the right hon. Gentleman had done justice between the parties. He confessed the terms now proposed to be given to the companies were, in his opinion, exorbitant and preposterous beyond all reason. Still he thought that the House was bound by its bargain. Parliament undertook last year to pay these companies twenty years' purchase, and if it could be shown that the profits amounted to the sum set down the House could not help itself without breaking faith with the companies. He thought the bargain a very bad one, but he was afraid it must be carried out.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that however interesting might be the subject raised by the hon. Members for Cambridge (Mr. W. Fowler and Mr. R. Torrens) he should not be justified in going very largely into it, seeing that it was not exactly a practical question. At the same time he did not know that he could quite go the length of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford), who said that they were bound by the bargain of last year, and that to depart from it would be a breach of good faith. He thought, on the contrary, that the House were quite competent to repudiate the bargain if they thought it a bad one. The House, no doubt, did decide last year to acquire possession of this property. They thought that its acquisition would be a great public convenience and advantage, and there was no reason to think otherwise now. The question was, if the House still thought it desirable to acquire this property at all, whether the sum now proposed to be given for it was too much. He did not think he need go into the vexed question of whether twenty years' purchase was too large an amount or not. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) as, indeed, was his duty, had defended the course which he thought it right last year to take upon that subject; and he himself was, in fairness, bound to repeat what he had said on the last occasion when this subject was under discussion, that, although twenty years was the term fixed for the purchase of the profits up to June of last year, the business which the Government was going to buy was not up to June of last year, but up to next January. Hence, upon that calculation, the business would not be taken at twenty years purchase, but considerably under seventeen. The hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), in the discussion which was held last year, insisted that seventeen years' purchase would have been the proper price to pay; hence, the difference was reduced to something very small indeed. Having given the subject his best consideration, he must say, without expressing any opinion as to the terms of the bargain, that if they were to begin afresh he did not think they could get the property on better terms. The question was not whether lower terms might have been had last year, but whether the House were justified in giving this price now. The hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. R. Torrens) had impugned the estimate laid upon the table of the House, and he felt bound to answer one or two of the remarks which had been made. The hon. Member compared, as it was very easy to do, the estimate made by Mr. Scudamore last year and the year before with that made by the same gentleman in the present year, and it was not extraordinary that he had been able to find out some discrepancies arising from the additional information which had been acquired. Estimates, at first, were necessarily vague; they subsequently became more precise, and must, of course, show some variation in detail. The hon. Member, however, could not complain that the recent estimate of revenue to be expected was unduly magnified to meet the emergency; for the estimate laid before the House the other day was much more moderate than the one previously presented. At first, Mr. Scudamore had before him only the information which could be obtained with regard to certain foreign countries, whereas the estimate presented the other day was based entirely on the experience of our own country, upon the number of telegrams sent last year, and upon an anticipated increase corresponding to the increase which had been found in practice to follow the reductions of tariff similar to that which the Government were about to make. Nothing, he believed, could be more moderate than that estimate of probable revenue, and he should be very much disappointed if it were not considerably exceeded. The hon. Member had also passed some criticisms upon the last estimate of expenditure compared with the former estimate made by Mr. Scudamore. As he had explained to the House the other day, the last estimate of expenditure was made upon a careful computation and consideration of the actual number of posts and wires that would have to be maintained, of the number of electric machines that would be in operation, of the staff at each electric station; in fact, upon a detailed estimate of the whole expenditure. This was obviously very different from the former estimates, which could only be prepared on general data. The hon. Member had also criticized some minor points; he said, for instance, that the item of compensation was entirely omitted. In that he was quite mistaken—it was not considered desirable to put down every separate item, as the exact amount which would have to be paid by way of compensation, as that might have excited undue expectation in particular quarters, as well as have raised up claims that it might be inconvenient to deal with. But in the item of £191,000 for salaries, &c., a sum had been inserted which would be quite sufficient to cover everything required for compensation. The hon. Member also compared the estimate given of 7*d.* as the expenditure for each message with this item of £191,000. But the estimate of 7*d.* a message had reference to a great many other items besides this £191,000, as he could show if time permitted. With a view of showing that the estimates were inaccurate, the hon. Member had asserted that the Government only allowed for a reduction of 25 per cent in the number of messages, the tariff of which would be raised from 6*d.* to 1*s.* The Government began by estimating that these messages would be reduced 50 per cent, but against this they held that they were entitled to set off the 15 per cent general increase which was looked for all over the country on account of the increased facilities for telegraphic communication which would be afforded. Deducting the 15 from the 50 per cent, there remained a balance of 35 per cent, which the Government recognized as the probable loss on this class of messages. As to the Motion of the hon. Member for Cambridge, he sincerely hoped it would not be pressed. The hon. Member, no doubt, entertained a strong opinion upon the question; but it was certainly remarkable that he should have postponed his Motion till after the Bill had been considered by the Select Committee, and by them reported to the House. Even if the Bill could now be re-committed to the same Committee, the House would see that the object which the hon. Member contemplated would not be accomplished. As to the Resolution of the 20th July, 1860, to which he referred, that was altogether a misconception on the part of the hon. Member. In the first place, that Resolution no longer existed, for upon his own Motion, the other day, that Resolution had been repealed and another substituted for it. It related, moreover, to quite a different sort of contract from those now under consideration—that was to say, to contracts entered into by the Government on their own responsibility, and which, till the passing of that Resolution, had never been submitted to the House in any shape. Here, on the contrary, contracts had not only been submitted to the House, but embodied in a Bill, which, after consideration by a Select Committee and by the House in all its stages, received the sanction of the House and became law. What possible analogy could there be between contracts such as these, and contracts entered into by the Government on their own responsibility, which very properly were required to be submitted for the consideration of the House? Had there been time he should have been delighted to submit the estimates that had been laid upon the table for examination by a Select Committee; but the House would perceive that a period of the Session had now arrived when the re-committal of the Bill and the submission of the estimates to a Committee would be tantamount to the rejection of the Bill. It was for the House to consider whether the terms proposed to be given, high as they undoubtedly were, were so high as to justify the setting aside of what he believed to be the almost unanimous desire of the country that the Government should go on with this undertaking, and whether they would accept the responsibility of postponing this measure for several years, with the risk meanwhile—for there was a risk—that ultimately they might have to pay a much larger sum for the purchase than was at present proposed. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 148; Noes 23: Majority 125.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 and 2, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Interpretation of terms).

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he wished to draw attention to the extension of the definition of the word "telegraph" under this clause, which defined that word as including all modes of sending messages by means of signals, while a subsequent clause proposed to give the Government a monopoly of all telegraphic business. The Bill as it stood, therefore, would prevent any private person from conveying messages by signals of whatever nature they might be, and would have the effect, therefore, of putting a stop to all projects for improving the existing system of carrying messages by signal. In the Act of 1863 the word "telegraph" was defined as meaning wires used for the purpose of telegraphic communication, and that appeared to him to be amply sufficient for the purpose of the Government. During the last two or three years a very ingenious system of conveying messages by means of flashing lights had been invented, and the clause as it stood would prevent any extension of that system.

Mr. WALTER said, he thought the Committee would do well to give their attention to the remarks which had fallen from his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bouverie). The subject was one to which he had intended to direct the notice of the Committee himself. It was a very serious thing to propose that the Government should have a monopoly not only in the existing process, but also in any process which might be hereafter discovered. If the Committee examined the clause they would find that it would give the Government a monopoly of every means of communicating by signals. The words of the clause were sufficiently wide to embrace speaking by the fingers, and it appeared to him that spirit-rapping might also be held to be included, because, according to what its professors stated, spirit-rapping was a system of transmitting messages by means of signals. The monopoly enjoyed by the Post Office was something of a totally different character from that which the Government were going to claim under this Bill. The monopoly of the Post Office gave that Department the exclusive right of conveying letters and messages by means of railways, mail-coaches, dog-carts, and so forth; but the monoply which the Government were going to claim under this Bill would give them the exclusive right of conveying messages of an incorporeal character, not only by wires, but by any other means which the ingenuity of mankind might hereafter devise. In the Report of the evidence taken before the Committee it was said that somebody had taken out a patent for transmitting messages without the medium of a wire. That notion seemed to be ridiculous, but it was 300 years old. Hon. Members would find in the *Spectator* reference made to an account given by an Italian author, 300 years ago, of an imaginary mode of correspondence, which, with the exception of the wire, exactly corresponded to the telegraph of the present day. There was no wire, but the dial plate and the characters were accurately described. If the Government were to have a monopoly it ought to be limited to the existing process. Certainly they ought not to have a monopoly of a science which was now only in its infancy and of which we could not foresee the future development.

Mr. MACFIE said, he had an Amendment on the Paper before "signals" to insert the word "telegraphic."

MR. GRAVES said, he would suggest that the words "magnetic, electric, and voltaic" should be inserted before the word "signals."

MR. D. DALRYMPLE thought that the word "electric" would be sufficient.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said he had no objection to the insertion of the words proposed by the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) or of the word "electric" only.

Amendment *moved*, before "signals" to insert "telegraphic."—(*Mr. Macfie.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 4 (The Postmaster General to have exclusive privilege of sending messages, with certain exceptions).

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON rose to move an Amendment. He said that in the opinion of the Government it was necessary to give the Government a monopoly. By the clause as it stood a monopoly would only be given to them for seven years, but if it were given at all there was no reason why it should not be given permanently. The reasons in favour of a monopoly were so obvious that had such a proposal not been summarily rejected by the Committee of last year he should hardly have thought it necessary to bring forward any arguments to show its necessity. The taking up of the telegraphs would cost the Government £7,000,000. A complete system could be constructed for less than that; but Parliament—and he thought very wisely—would never have consented to any attempt on the part of the Government to supplant the existing companies without paying them. At the same time if the Government took up the telegraphs with the object of developing the system for the benefit of the public at large, it would never do to allow them to be opposed in particular places where messages would pay at a very cheap rate. For instance, he had no doubt that between the Stock Exchanges of some of our great towns it might be found profitable to send messages for 6*d.* or some such sum. If an opposition of that kind were commenced against a company they would meet it by reducing the scale of charge in the particular places where the opposition was offered, but the Government could not do so. They must have a uniform tariff, and if they reduced it to 6*d.* or 3*d.* in one place they must reduce it over the whole country. He thought, therefore, a monopoly was necessary. If it were not a proper thing to grant, it ought not to be granted, but if it were he thought it ought to be granted permanently. Of course Parliament would always have power to take it away again. Of course, as far as the Post Office was concerned, he highly approved the proviso proposed by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hunt), limiting the monopoly therein to seven years. It certainly made the clause more innocuous than it otherwise would be. But he would ask whether the proviso, after all, was a right one. If any company or individual was entitled to compensation, was it right to debar him from the opportunity of being heard in support of his claim? If he was not entitled to compensation, was it likely that he would succeed in getting it? He would therefore move, in lines 13 and 14, to leave out the words "for the period of seven years and until the end of the then next Session of Parliament."

Amendment proposed, in page 3, lines 13 and 14, to leave out the words "for the period of seven years and until the end of the then next Session of Parliament."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

MR. HUNT said, that the Committee by whom this subject was considered last year came to the conclusion, on a division by 6 to 1, that no monopoly ought to be granted to the Government at all, and the Bill of last year was, he believed, adopted with so much readiness by the House chiefly on that account. The change of Government occurred, and in the Select Committee to which the Bill was referred this year, a decided preference was evinced for restricted as against complete monopoly. These two facts he therefore maintained were sufficient to show that the Bill ought not now to be lightly disturbed. The evidence given before the Committee last year went to show that as long as they conducted their business properly the Post Office would have a practical monopoly, if not a legal one, for Parliament no doubt would readily assent to a renewal of the monopoly. But it was, in his opinion, most important that Parliament should keep a check in its hands over the working of this system, so that new inventions might be taken advantage of, and the public should have the power, under favourable circumstances, of demanding a reduction of rates. He thought that the clause in its present state, which was a sort of compromise between the advocates and the opponents of monopoly, should be allowed to remain.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER observed that the arguments advanced by the noble Marquess the Postmaster General had not been answered. The country was buying not merely the plant connected with these telegraphs, but the whole of the business, and why were they not to get that for which they paid? They paid, and dearly too, for the whole of the business, and those engaged in it now ought not to be allowed at any future time to re-commence operations. If the monopoly was not to be given, the money ought not to be paid; if the money ought to be paid, the monopoly ought to be granted. The proviso advocated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) contemplated the possibility of the Post Office losing the monopoly at some future time. The result of that would be that the Post Office would have a complete monopoly over those districts where there was a loss, and be exposed to a ruinous competition when there was any success. If the House thought they were not to be trusted, it would be better not to accede to the proposal before the House; but unless they had this monopoly the purchase of these telegraphs would be a waste of money at the immense price the Government was called upon to pay —a price of which he, at all events, washed his hands altogether. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) had accused them of appropriating the honour of this measure. He had not the slightest desire to contest the point with the right hon. Gentleman, who was welcome to it all. The matter was found by the present Government in so complicated a state that it was impossible for them to recede; but unless the House was prepared to grant them that without which they believed it would be impossible to carry on the business effectively, it would be better that they should reject the Bill altogether.

Mr. SCOURFIELD said, he had always felt that if the messages were delivered at a low rate they would be exposed to a loss, and if at a high rate they would be exposed to unpopularity, and he certainly agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it would be better not to carry the Bill unless the Government obtained a monopoly. He was reminded of an old observation that there were always people to be found who were getting in the way merely for the purpose of being paid to get out of it.

Mr. WHITWELL said, he thought it was a most unreasonable thing to ask the Government to give the telegraph companies seventeen years' purchase for their property, and to only take a monopoly for seven years. He wished, however, to have some information as to the accommodation which the public were to receive. It might, for instance, be desirable to have two telegraphs to a town, and that it should not be excluded from telegraphic communication on a Sunday.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed in his speech to lose sight of the fact that the present transaction, though a costly one, still must be regarded simply in the light of an experiment. The Government were about to undertake an entirely new service for the public. The Committee must not forget that a service might be dear and yet be bad, and he, for one, was of opinion that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) to afford Parliament, after a certain number of years' experience of the system, an opportunity of inquiring into the working of the monopoly was very fair. The effect of that proposal would not necessarily be, as was argued, to terminate the monopoly at the end of seven years. The way in which it would operate would probably be that at the expiration of five or six years an inquiry would be instituted into the working of the Act, when, if there were any complaints made of the badness or the dearness of the service, some means of meeting them might be devised. For his own part, he looked upon the proposal as by no means unreasonable.

Mr. WALTER said, it was quite clear from the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as well as from other speeches which had been addressed to the Committee, that the monopoly clauses were regarded by some hon. Members as a kind of compensation for a bad bargain. Now, no mention was made in that House of monopoly last year, and the first inkling of it was contained in a speech delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer during the elections. But whatever other arguments there might be—and that there were arguments he did not mean to deny — in favour of giving the Government a monopoly in telegraphic communication, he did not think the argument of his right hon. Friend was a valid one. If the Government had made a bad bargain with the telegraph companies, that was no good reason why they should saddle the country with all the disadvantages of a monopoly system for eternity. "But," said the right hon. Gentleman, "we paid for these rights, and why should we not have them?" The Government, however, could not have purchased that which the companies had no power to sell. The companies did not possess a monopoly, and how, under those circumstances, was it open to the Government to come down to that House and lay claim to it on the ground that they had paid a high price for the business of those companies? There was, he might add, a great distinction between the Post Office monopoly and that of the telegraph. The Post Office monopoly conferred on the Post Office the exclusive right of carrying parcels and letters by the ordinary means of conveyance; but anybody else might make use of those modes of conveyance. In the case of the telegraph, however, the public could not have a second string to their bow, for the Government claimed not only the exclusive right of sending telegraphic messages, but exclusive control over the instrument by which they were sent. The two cases were therefore by no means parallel. He should like to read to the Committee what was the opinion on the subject of some of the really working men of the Post Office, especially of Mr. Scudamore, who, having been asked whether he thought a monopoly necessary, replied—

> "We neither ask for it, nor do I think we ought to ask for it."

Again, he said—

> "As long as we do the work well, with such an organization as we have, we can defy competition."

He added—

> "There is no protection given in the case of the Money Order Office. Anybody could set one up to compete with us. . . . On the whole, I am inclined to think that a legal monopoly would be a disadvantage instead of an advantage to us, because it would compel all inventors and patentees to look to us only for the use of their inventions, and would often compel us to try worthless ones."

Professor Jevons said—

> "I should be against a legal monopoly; I think there is no need for it, and there are many reasons against it. The practical monopoly which the Government will enjoy will only arise from their doing the work better and cheaper than private companies."

He could only find one witness who was in favour of giving the Government a monopoly, and that gentleman, he had been informed, was not a very successful inventor in connection with the electric telegraph himself. The title which the Post Office had to a monopoly depended, he might add, on its cheapness and regularity, and not on any legal power. The Government, too, had bought the wayleaves of the existing railway companies, and how, under these circumstances, he should like to know, was any telegraph company to set up in opposition to them, except along the turnpike roads? And how was it to get the turnpike roads? For his own part he was of opinion that the House ought not to tie its hands in the matter, so that it should be free to act in the event of the Government not performing the work satisfactorily.

DR. BREWER said, he thought that Parliament would always have the right and the power of preventing the continuance of an improper exercise of the monopoly.

MR. HENLEY said, that before he heard the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer he was inclined to think favourably of the Amendment of his Colleague the noble Marquess who sat beside him. That speech, however, disclosed such an uneasy state of mind as to the price which had been paid to the telegraph companies that he was afraid the public would be made to suffer severely if the monopoly asked for were granted.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 27; Noes 123: Majority 96.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Exceptions).

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, this clause enacted that private messages might be sent by private lines of telegraph. There was some uncertainty, however, whether the clause would extend to private lines of telegraph which might be constructed after the Bill became law. He hoped the noble Marquess would explain the matter.

Mr. MONK wished to know whether the telegraph offices would be open on Sundays?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he believed there could be no doubt that the clause would be applicable to telegraphs hereafter to be established, as well as to those already existing. There would be no diminution of the accommodation now afforded to the public. On the contrary, the various offices, when placed under the control of the Government, would be open a greater number of hours day and night than they now were. On Sundays the telegraph offices would be open, at all events, wherever they were now.

Mr. GRAVES moved the insertion of words to exempt from the operation of the Bill telegrams transmitted by telegraphs maintained by corporations, companies, or persons, when such telegrams were not transmitted for any valuable consideration.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 6 to 11, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Postmaster General must transmit foreign messages).

The Marquess of HARTINGTON proposed to insert the word "may" instead of "shall."

Mr. R. TORRENS objected to the Amendment, on the ground that it would give the Government a power of choosing what foreign Government or company should communicate with America or other nations through our system. What would happen in case of two companies in Russia should wish to communicate with America by joining a submarine cable with our system? Would the Government exercise a power of choice as between the two?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that no such consideration influenced the Government in framing this clause.

Sir JOHN GRAY also thought that the power should be compulsory.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH asked if messages could be passed through in cypher if required?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, they could be so passed if required.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 13 to 19, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 20 (Annual accounts to be laid before Parliament).

Mr. MACFIE expressed a hope that telegrams would be sent at such a price that the poor would have the advantage which was now confined to the rich.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, as soon as the tariff could be reduced below 1*s.* with safety to the Revenue and convenience to the Post Office, it would be.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 21 to 23, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 24 (Messages to be deemed post letters).

Mr. STAVELEY HILL asked whether a telegram sent during election times would be regarded as a post letter, and be incapable of being produced as evidence in a court of justice?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, this Bill would make no difference whatever, as he understood the matter, in the existing law in regard to the inviolability of telegrams.

Mr. MONK said, this was an important question, and he would like to know whether the information which may come into the possession of the Government would be liable to be used in a court of law?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Sullivan) said, as he understood it, a telegram was just as much privileged as a letter. It would be producible as evidence in a court of justice, according to a principle of law that was acted upon every day. Nothing would be more pernicious than to make the Government the recipient of confidential messages which must remain in its hands. A letter was not privileged against production, and neither should a telegram be.

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER entirely agreed with his right hon. and learned Friend, who, he believed, had correctly stated the law; and it would be very inexpedient that it should be altered. At present the telegraph company could be compelled under the rules of a court of justice to produce the papers placed in their hands containing the messages to be transmitted by them.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

ACCOUNTS, &C. PRESENTATION BILL.

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Presentation of Accounts, Statements, Returns, and Documents to Parliament, *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 240.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 27th July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Valuation of Property (Metropolis)* (229); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (230); Straits Settlements* (231); Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment* (232); Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment* (233); Millbank Prison* (234); Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment* (235).

Second Reading — County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act (1868) Amendment* (173); Contagious Diseases* (221); Shipping Dues Exemption Act (1867) Amendment* (178); Cinque Ports Act Amendment* (216); Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment* (108).

Report—Bankruptcy* (208); Imprisonment for Debt* (224); Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* (225).

Third Reading—Debts of Deceased Persons* (169); Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2)* (205); High Constables' Office Abolition, &c.* (99), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Tenants Purchase by Instalments (Ireland) (161).

TENANTS' PURCHASE BY INSTALMENTS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 161.)

(*The Lord Dunsany.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD DUNSANY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that though this was a very unpretending measure, he believed a single instance of its successful operation would considerably extend its usefulness. Its object was to enable tenants, with the consent of their landlords, to purchase the fee simple of their holdings, the purchase money being payable by instalments. It did not in any way interfere between the owners and the public who might be purchasers; it was not in the remotest degree a tenant-right Bill, but simply assumed that the landowner was the best judge of the expediency of the sale, and that the tenant might be the best and, perhaps, the only purchaser; and, while establishing no new principles and conferring no new powers, it would render practicable that which was now virtually impossible. It would operate in this way—If a landlord who did not succeed in selling property in the usual way ascertained that one of his tenants was willing to purchase, the payment of the first instalment would entitle the latter to a certificate as provisional holder. At the end of five years he would pay a second and at the end of ten years a third instalment, being thereupon entitled to a conveyance from the Landed Estates Court. If after paying one or more instalments the tenant failed to complete the purchase, both landlord and tenant would revert to their former position, such instalments being held equivalent to the payment of so much rent. It might, perhaps, be thought that a landlord would not enter into such a contract; but to meet this objection he would be entitled to increase the rent, so as to make it somewhat penal in the event of the purchase not being completed. It would be necessary to add a clause debarring the tenant from subletting or injuring the property. The first step on entering into a contract was usually a very expensive one, but the Bill would simplify and cheapen it. Mr. Bright the present President of the Board of Trade had proposed that the landlords should be bought out by the Government; but his wish would rather be to keep the landlords at home, and he should not favour any Bill which would tend to lessen the already too small number of resident landlords. He thought, however, it might be an advantage if they were induced to sell outlying and distant properties—for it was a fact, which history perhaps might explain, that the owner of land in one county generally held land in one or more other counties. The measure would not require a single shilling to be advanced by the Treasury as the scheme proposed by the right hon. Gentleman would do. Mr. Bright contemplated the creation of a class of small proprietors, by converting the present occupiers indiscriminately into proprietors; but under this Bill the occupiers who would become proprietors would be a picked class, being those who by their industry and thrift had saved sufficient money to pay a first instalment. Even those, however, who agreed with Mr. Bright's views might support this Bill as a step in the right direction, while it was free from the objection that it infringed upon the rights of property. He believed that noble Lords on his own side of the House did not look forward with much confidence or hope to land legislation for Ireland, and would be glad if there was no prospect of any; but the Government had promised to introduce a measure next Session, and a very excellent Bill was about to come before their Lordships this evening. Should, however, any subsequent legislation be proposed, this Bill would not in any way interfere with it; and if there should be none it would, in a small way, accomplish some useful ends. At this period of the Session he could not hope to proceed further with this measure, but he hoped the House would give it a second reading, since it did not profess to touch the question of tenant-right and would not stand in the way of more comprehensive legislation.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Dunsany.*)

Lord DUFFERIN said, he would readily acknowledge the noble Lord's intimate acquaintance with Ireland, and his attention to his duties as an Irish landlord entitled any proposal he might submit on this subject to respectful attention. He had, however, in common with more competent persons whose opinion he had consulted, been unable to discover in the Bill any power which the landlord did not already possess of entering into any description of contract with his tenant. Considering the late period of the Session, and that the Government would probably introduce, at the commencement of next Session, a Bill affecting the tenure of land, or at all events for placing on a more satisfactory footing the relations of landlord and tenant, he would appeal to the noble Lord, whether it would not be better to defer till then any suggestions he might have to offer.

Lord CAIRNS also recommended the withdrawal of the Bill. It appeared to him to be perfectly innocuous, for it pointed to arrangements which might be very desirable; but he was not at all certain that everything which it contemplated might not be already done by agreement between a landlord and a tenant, if they were so disposed. It purported to facilitate the purchase of land by tenants, and though it only pointed to a sale by agreement, it might, if read a second time, give rise to an impression that it went in the direction of a compulsory transfer of land from one person to another. He hoped the noble Lord would be satisfied for this Session with having submitted the Bill.

Lord DUNSANY said, he was willing to withdraw the Bill, remarking, however, that as the law now stood it was impossible to induce Irish farmers to enter into such contracts.

Motion and Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

TENURE (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 36.)

(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, he did not intend to proceed with the measure at this period of the Session. He wished, however, to explain that he dissociated it entirely from what was now called the land question, for it did not affect the ownership of land or the legitimate rights either of owners in fee, leaseholders, or occupiers, but was simply designed to remedy the flaws and obscurities of the existing law, so as to enable parties connected with the letting and holding of land to establish and recover their rights without much expense. In 1860, Mr. Cardwell introduced a measure based on the same principle as this Bill—namely, contract between man and man; but, unfortunately, it permitted implied conditions and constructions which rendered engagements made under it uncertain and obscure, and it expressly recognized, though without defining, implied contracts. Its terms, moreover, were extremely ambiguous, though its principle was admittedly sound. Irish landlords and tenants also were grateful to the noble Lords who in a former Session bestowed so much attention on the present Bill in a Select Committee, particularly to the noble Earl below him (the Earl of Clarendon) and to Earl Grey, who devoted so much assiduity and trouble to it. It had not been pressed in the present Session, on account not of any want of confidence in its provisions, but on account of a question totally different from that of an amelioration of the law having been raised. The question now discussed in newspapers, speeches by agitators, and, he was sorry to add, by many Members of Parliament at the late election, who ought to have known better, was whether the present occupiers were to take possession of the land by lease or in fee simple, regardless of the rights of the landlords. If an occupier obtained a Parliamentary title to a lease under the name of fixity of tenure, he would practically become the owner — in other words, it was confiscation. Mr. Bright, to whose scheme the noble Lord opposite (Lord Dunsany) had referred, desired the creation of a class of small proprietors; but he (the Marquess of Clanricarde) very much doubted whether the condition of any country had been improved by taking land or any other property from large possessors and dividing it among small proprietors. Such measures had not proved satisfactory in France and other countries. To any such scheme as that of Mr. Bright there must be three parties —landlords ready to sell, tenants ready to buy, and the State ready both to buy and sell. Now, he ventured to predict that the only parties who would enter with alacrity into such a project would be the landlords. No doubt plenty of landlords would be willing to sell their property if offered the full value; but he doubted if Parliament, however strong this or any future Ministry might be, or however many dissolutions might be resorted to, would ever be persuaded to buy the land in order to sell it to small proprietors. As to giving occupiers by Act of Parliament leases for twenty-one, thirty-one, or sixty-one years, this would virtually be conferring on them the ownership of the land. It would, moreover, be a despotism hitherto unknown in any country to insist that an occupier should be made to continue in his occupation for a considerable number of years. Even in Russia the policy of binding men to the soil had been abandoned. He was sorry that such a project had been started at a time when horrible crimes were being committed connected with the land, for he was convinced that the principle of this Bill—that was to say, the principle of regulating the relations between landlords and tenants—was the best that could be proposed. He was told, indeed, that it did not go far enough; but he had no objection to going further, provided the principle of voluntary and well-defined agreements between landlord and tenant was adhered to. Unless the Government introduced a measure at the commencement of next Session, he should re-introduce this Bill, and should endeavour to press it through both Houses. The Government were supposed to be bound to take up the subject, and in that case he entreated them to lose no time, for there had been already too much hesitation and paltering with it, with very mischievous consequences. He would urge them in the shortest space of time consistent with that personal relaxation to which they were entitled as well as private Members, after the labours of the Session, to frame a measure, which need be no Cabinet secret, but should be made known to Parliament and the country at the earliest possible date. He had now to move that the Order for the House to be put into Committee be discharged.

Motion *agreed to:* Order *discharged.*

NEW ZEALAND.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON, who had given notice to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the present position of Affairs in New Zealand, said, the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies (Earl Granville) has lately laid on the table, by command of Her Majesty, a bulky volume of 600 pages of correspondence on the affairs of New Zealand. The first portion of it consists mainly of complaints on the part of Sir George Grey with reference to the course I pursued when I held the Seals of the Colonial Office; but I do not think it necessary to address myself to those complaints, though I shall be prepared, whenever the necessity arises, to justify the policy which I recommended the Crown to adopt. It also contains recriminatory matter which it would serve no useful purpose to enter into; and it raises various questions of possible and impossible policy as regards New Zealand, which I likewise propose to pass by. The only points to which I invite your Lordships' attention are the present position of the colony, and the difficulties arising from a certain sense of financial exhaustion, from the undoubted danger with regard to the Maories, and from a strong feeling of local irritation. Now, there are in New Zealand two parties and two policies—the party and policy of independence, and the party and policy which looks to the mother country for protection and assistance. It is easy, of course, to lay down the broad rules that in colonial matters the Home Government is concerned only with the external relations of the country, and that the Colonial Government is concerned solely with matters of internal regulation and police. That rule is perfectly sound; but the lines of external and domestic policy are constantly intercepting and crossing each other, and they are very difficult to define. Moreover, in New Zealand there are complications caused by the presence of the native tribes and their warlike character, by the peculiar physical geography of the country which cuts it up into various parts, with various feelings and difficulties, by a Constitution hastily and I think inadvisedly given, and by the conditions under which Imperial troops have from time to time been employed. They have sometimes been employed solely at the charge and under the orders of the Home Government—the objection to which is that this country is thus called upon to bear the expense of native wars; sometimes under the orders of the Colonial Government — which is still more objectionable, for it would involve our carrying on a war while the policy by which that war was caused would be determined by others; and there has more than once been a tendency to regulate their employment by the joint councils of the Home and the Colonial Governments—which of all policies seems to me the most objectionable, since it would necessarily lead to a division and confusion of power. All these questions and considerations, though perhaps not very familiar to your Lordships, have been discussed over and over again in the colony, and have greatly complicated this matter. I think the independence of New Zealand was in former years somewhat prematurely given, that the Constitution was not calculated to work well, and that the abandonment of native affairs was premature on our part; but, whether or not this be so, the fact remains that it has been done, and that we must accept it. I feel satisfied, too, that when the temporary irritation existing in the minds of the colonists has passed by they will be ready and anxious to accept that fact also. There can, it seems to me, be no retreat from the course we have adopted, and in its main lines the policy pursued by successive Colonial Secretaries, by Mr. Cardwell, by myself, by my noble Friend (the Duke of Buckingham), and by the noble Earl (Earl Granville), must be adhered to. I believe the present irritation is not founded on any solid or substantial grounds of policy, and that the colonists themselves are far too self-reliant and manly to wish to be relieved from their duties, or placed in a position unlike that of any other British colony. That irritation, I am convinced, is due to misconception—not on both sides, for I do not think there is any in this country, but in the colony. It also arises from a very simple cause, the operation of which I have more than once remarked. We, in England, are sometimes so engrossed with the mass of Public Business, with one first-class question crowding upon another, that we are obliged to pass by colonial questions with comparatively little debate, and to appear sometimes as giving them apparently less attention than they deserve. Now, to the colonists, a question which to us is only one of a hundred, is one of vital moment, and they fancy we are indifferent when we are not really so; and such is their feeling for this country that I believe they would sometimes bear injustice rather than indifference. I believe both parties in this case entertain the warmest feelings towards each other. I have seen enough of the colonists to know their strong attachment to this country, and I am sure that as warm feelings are entertained for them in this country as for any part of the United Kingdom. It is no slight advantage to us that in all parts of the world there should be communities speaking the same language, holding the same institutions, animated very much by the same sympathies, and subjects of the same Sovereign, and we are not likely to undervalue it. On the other hand, these colonies give a free vent for all the activity and energy which find insufficient scope in this country; and it is no slight advantage to them that they bear the name of Englishmen, and are members of the British Empire. History furnishes no example of such a colonial Empire as ours—an Empire from which we exact no tribute, on which we impose no restraint, and to which, sometimes on being asked and sometimes without being asked, we have freely accorded perfect independence. It has been the fate of other great Empires — Spain and Venice for example—to be detested by their colonies, and I believe it was because they pursued a policy exactly opposite to that which for the last quarter-of-a-century we have adopted. I cannot believe, therefore, that there exists in New Zealand any feeling of misconception or irritation which goes deeper than the surface, for the essential lines of our policy are lines recognized both by them and by us, and nobody can say that we are laying a burden upon them, and requiring them to strain their resources for our own private advantage. As to the course which should be pursued in the present state of affairs, it is very difficult to give an answer. New Zealand claimed some time ago the control of their own affairs, and it was given them by Sir George Grey, when Governor, on his own authority and responsibility, the act, however, being subsequently endorsed by the Duke of Newcastle. Mr. Cardwell, on succeeding to the Colonial Office, made various offers in respect to the troops, which were substantially declined; and on succeeding him I renewed those offers with little variation, when they were again substantially declined. The colony, or a part of the colony—for I doubt whether the feeling be general—seems now disposed to retrace their steps; but the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) has declined, as I understand, either to leave the troops there or to resume the control of native affairs; and the Treasury has refused, under present circumstances, any financial guarantee to the colony for the purposes of war. It is difficult to say what can be advised; but I may venture on this suggestion, whatever it may be worth. A great part of the present difficulties is due to the distance by which we are separated from New Zealand and the importance of carrying on communications with that colony. Misunderstandings are under those circumstances very likely to arise; and it seems to me to be possible that some one on the spot, accredited by Her Majesty's Government, enjoying their confidence and also the confidence of the colonists, and armed with whatever powers the Government might think fit to entrust to him, might make inquiries and offer suggestions which might bring about a better state of things. Your Lordships will recollect that this is not altogether a novel proposal. Years ago, when matters had assumed a very formidable appearance in Canada, and when the differences between the two Provinces brought things almost to a dead-lock, Lord Durham was sent out from this country, and no one can doubt that great benefit resulted from his mission. In like manner, in the case of Jamaica, Sir Henry Storks was sent out to restore order; and, lastly, when in 1859 difficulties of a peculiarly delicate nature arose in the Ionian Islands, no less a person than the present Prime Minister undertook a mission to those islands, which, although it did not at the moment effect all that was thought desirable, yet produced this result—that his presence there allayed in a great measure the discord which prevailed, tended to soften the asperities and bitterness of feeling which existed, and paved the way for a more satisfactory state of things. I throw out this suggestion, my Lords, without in any degree insisting upon it, for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. If some such course be not adopted with regard to New Zealand, then the only alternative it appears to me to which we can have recourse is to allow the colonists themselves to work out their own fortune and policy, while we give them every assistance which we can legitimately afford in working out that fortune and policy, the main outlines of which have been laid down by successive Secretaries of State. I have always taken a deep interest in the colony of New Zealand, and I should be very glad to see this feeling of temporary misunderstanding removed and a much more satisfactory state of feeling as to the relations between the colony and the mother country substituted in its place.

EARL GRANVILLE: I think the noble Earl has been very judicious in what he has omitted to notice in the speech which he has just made. As your Lordships will observe, I came down to the House prepared with a considerable amount of ammunition in the event of any attack being made on the policy of the Government; but I am bound to say that all that has fallen from the noble Earl tends to justify and strengthen the Government in pursuing the course which they have followed, and which is a course really consistent with that which has been adopted by their predecessors in Office. I feel also greatly the advantage of not being obliged, by the observations which have been made by the noble Earl, to enter very much into this question. Filling unworthily as I do the position which I happen to occupy with regard to the colonies, I should not like to be compelled to come forward in this House at all in the shape of an advocate against New Zealand; and it is, unfortunately, very difficult, when complaints and attacks are made in Parliament on the policy of the Government, not to enter into full explanations in order to show where we think others have been wrong and we ourselves in the right. I quite agree with the noble Earl in what he said with regard to the position in which the country might find itself in the case of an internal war in the colony. First arises the question whether the mother country should take upon herself the defence of the colony and the perfect control of that war. Then comes the question whether, losing a portion of that control, she is still liable to furnish the colony with military aid, and by means of the double government, to which the noble Earl has referred, to lead the Crown and the colony into very great difficulties. Lastly comes the question whether, the whole power being vested in the colony, it should bear the entire responsibility. In the history of New Zealand each of the two former courses has been pursued from time to time; but it now appears that, after considerable delay we have come to adopt the last course, which seems to me to be the right one in the interest both of the mother country and of the colony itself. The policy of the Government, as indicated in the Papers which have been laid before Parliament, has been in the main approved by the noble Earl, and has, I believe, met with the general approval of the country. I do not wish to enter further into the question. I am of opinion that the great and important thing is to declare on the part of the Government their determination to adhere to that policy. The objection which I entertain to the suggestion which the noble Earl has thrown out, and which has been acted upon with advantage under some circumstances—though I think there would be great practical difficulties in the way in the present instance—is that it may create some doubt as to the principles on which the mother country is determined to act with regard to the colonies. The most important thing of all, with the view of removing that dissatisfaction, which I quite concur with the noble Earl in regarding as being of a temporary nature is, in my opinion, that we should understand perfectly our mutual relations, and that, with all those friendly offices to which he has also alluded, we should throw upon the Colonial Government the responsibility of shaping their policy in such a manner as that they should make up their minds to do that which is necessary to put an end to—what I can hardly call war, but that system of brigandage and outrage which exists, and—which I regard as being still more useful—to adopt those conciliatory measures towards the natives which are most likely to result in peace and conciliation. It only remains for me to thank the noble Earl for the manner in which he has brought the subject under your Lordships' notice.

THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD said, he would not enter into the past history of New Zealand, but he thought he should be wanting in his duty towards the colonists of New Zealand, as well as towards the natives of that country, if he were not to address a few words to their Lordships on the present occasion. Against the general policy which had been enunciated by the noble Earl at the head of the Colonial Department he had nothing to say, because he believed it to be strictly sound. It was but fair to add that the rejection of aid from England came from the colonists themselves in the first instance, and that one Prime Minister, Mr. Weld, had taken office on the distinct reliance upon local resources. He therefore entirely concurred with the noble Earl as to the strict justice of the view which he took. He at the same time agreed with the other noble Earl who was formerly at the head of the Colonial Office (the Earl of Carnarvon) in the opinion that there was nothing which the colonists felt more than indifference or neglect on the part of the mother country; but they probably forgot that they were but one of fifty colonies that required the attention and consideration of the Home Government. But it was not only the colonists, but the natives, whose interests were concerned, and he would ask whether it was not the Imperial Government who made the first contract with the latter? Had that contract, entered into in 1839, when the New Zealanders, who were broken up into small and hostile tribes, confiding in the power of England received the British Government for the express purpose of putting down anarchy and bloodshed—evils to which no one was more alive than the New Zealanders themselves—been fulfilled? He feared that contract had not been fulfilled; and on that ground alone he begged the Government to pause before they refused all further aid to the colony. New Zealand was at present composed of about 200,000 English settlers and about 30,000 or 40,000 natives, of which number he would undertake to say more than one-half were attached and loyal subjects of Her Majesty, while another portion was neutral and ready to be made loyal; those by whom the murders were committed—which had been properly called acts of brigandage—being only a contemptible minority. He therefore appealed to the Government, seeing how great the cost of employing soldiers in the colony was, and how difficult it was to keep colonial forces in any degree of discipline or subjection, to lend such assistance as would enable the colonists to put an end to that system of brigandage in a country in which the wars which, from time to time had occurred, had, he must say, been conducted in a most honourable and chivalrous manner. There were repeated examples of that. He must say that never were wars conducted by any European nation in a more honourable and chivalrous manner than the wars of these New Zealanders, so long as they were national wars. Now, however, that the native forces were broken up into small sections, the same results had followed which always ensued in other countries under similar circumstances. The principal chiefs, finding that they were unable to make head against the British troops in open fight, retired under the leadership of their native King into the heart of the country, where they shut themselves up in their fastnesses and maintained a sort of armed neutrality: others had divided themselves into small parties, and taking advantage of their knowledge of the country had attacked the outlying settlements. He had received a letter from the late Chief Justice, Sir William Martin, who went out to the colony in 1839. The writer said—

> "After the great calamity at Poverty Bay a storm arose in our newspapers of plans for preventing the like doings in other parts. Among the most prominent was one from Sir David Monro. He urged the suspension of the Constitution and the transfer of all power in native matters to a Dictator, to be sent out hither from England."

That, he believed, was the plan proposed by the noble Earl opposite.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he had not proposed such a scheme.

THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD said, that something similar had been proposed by the noble Earl. He had understood the noble Earl to say that the case was analogous to that of Jamaica and the Ionian Islands, and that it might be necessary to send out special Commissioners. He admitted, however, that the word "Dictator" had not been used by the noble Earl. Sir William Martin went on to say—

> "This met with some favour, but the extreme improbability of the English Government consenting to resume the management of native affairs, and various points in the plan itself, diminished the feeling in its favour. After waiting until it had become clear that Matutaera—the native King—and his people were minded to keep the peace, I addressed the enclosed memorandum to the Resident Minister, Dr. Pollen."

The word "King," he might remark, had been the source of much unnecessary offence. There had never been a King in the colony of New Zealand. The natives had only heard of a Queen, and their notion—not a very exalted one of a King—was taken from the Book of Judges. Well, Sir William Martin, proceeded as follows:—

> "He forwarded it with an expression of his entire concurrence to Wellington. No answer has as yet been received, but Dr. Pollen tells me that his letter was crossed by one from Mr. J. C. Richmond to himself, in which Mr. Richmond expressed his readiness to throw up the confiscated lands to a large extent. Since then our case has been strengthened by a letter from Mr. Serancke, full of details, of the accuracy of which he is satisfied. It appears that the murders at the White Cliff were committed by four men—whose names are known—from Mokau; that a raid was actually set on foot by a body of eighty men under one Reihana, and that on their march to Alexandra they were intercepted by Matutaera and his friends and driven back. Further, Mr. Serancke certifies that Rewi is clear of complicity in the late crimes, and has been steadily supporting Matutaera and Tamati. At the request of Dr. Pollen, I have written to Tamati to suggest for consideration three bases of peace, not as from the Government, but as suggestions made to them and to the Government—namely—1. That a district may be defined within which they may make and administer laws for themselves, and appoint their own chief magistrate. 2. That lands in Waikato shall be given to all who are willing to settle quietly down under the law. 3. That both sides shall co-operate for the purpose of repressing crimes of violence."

On this point he would call the attention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to a despatch sent by his predecessor, the Duke of Newcastle, to Governor Gore Browne — which was explained in my hearing to the native King by the well-known chief, William Thompson—to the effect that if the latter thought fit to assign a district to the chief magistrate chosen by the natives, in the same manner as the superintendents of the English provinces, he was quite at liberty to do so, provided that the laws made for such district should be submitted to the Governor for his confirmation. This might have been easily done. The island was at that time divided into six provinces—there were now nine — each of which had its own chief magistrate and its own provincial council, and it would have been easy to form a province in which the so-called native King should be superintendent; and if the native King would act with us and pass laws to be submitted to the consideration of the Governor he saw no reason why such a system should not be adopted. Governor Denison was of the same opinion—he said there was nothing to be afraid of in the name of King; the thing to be done was to recognize him, and make use of his authority for the maintenance of order. The possibility of doing this was proved by the fact that in the very district of which so much had been lately heard — the native-King district — he found, some years ago, the laws so carefully administered by the native magistrates that a traveller might leave his baggage by the wayside with the most perfect safety, because nobody stole there. He asked how it was that they did not steal there. They said—"Some do not steal from the fear of God, while others do not steal from the fear of the £5"—the fine imposed by the native King for every theft that was committed in the district. The stories told of the force of law in the reign of King Alfred were literally fulfilled in this part of New Zealand. And this it must be remembered was done by the natives themselves. He believed that at that period the King might have inaugurated a system of good government in the very heart of the country. The people most earnestly desired that this might be done, for the New Zealanders were essentially a law-loving people. When he first went out to that colony the natives paid willing deference to the authority both of the magistrates and missionaries, and it was not until the effect began to be felt of what is called the Queen's right of pre-emption—that was to say that the natives might sell their land to the Crown only—that the idea of the Queen's sovereignty began to be degraded in the eyes of the people. Those who referred to the earlier documents would find that this was the very result predicted by acting Governor Shortland. When the sovereignty of the Queen was ordered to be proclaimed over the whole of the Northern Island in 1840, Governor Hobson wrote to Lord John Russell to the following effect:—

> "If I am to carry out this instruction I must have a much larger force placed at my command, as there are many breaches of the peace and civil wars among the people which I must suppress."

What the answer was he did not know; but from the failure of that despatch in procuring any sufficient assistance from England he dated the source of all the present troubles in New Zealand. The agents of the Government for the purchase of ground had done incalculable injury by going about the country in a very injudicious manner buying up the land—often from the wrong man—and from that the civil wars and bloodshed had arisen. In the neighbourhood of New

Plymouth two sections of a tribe engaged in civil war, in consequence of a Government agent having bought land from an individual against the will of the tribe to whom it belonged. It was only when they came within the boundary of the English settlement that a proclamation was issued warning the natives that if they fought on what was called the Queen's ground they would be considered the Queen's enemies. Of course it was understood that outside that boundary they might fight as long as they pleased. This was very far from being a fulfilment of the contract originally entered into with those tribes who accepted the Queen's sovereignty. They had accepted our government on the condition that we should preserve them from the consequences of anarchy among themselves; and yet twenty years after that contract was entered into we found them making war against one another in every part of the colony. He might sum up all by referring to a text cited on a public occasion by William Thompson, who was called "the King-maker." It was this verse from St. Paul, — "Ye have reigned as kings without us; would to God ye did reign." In the eagerness for land the Government had abdicated all those functions of government which alone induced the natives to accept our rule. He would ask their Lordships were they to listen to those cold-blooded persons who said that the natives were perishing fast, that this was a war of extermination, and that it must take its course? If, indeed, the natives were to perish in God's providence from off the face of the earth, let us lift up our prayers for the remnant that is yet left—let us act in the spirit of that prayer by trying to fulfil the contract that we made twenty years ago—that the English and the New Zealanders should be one people. When on one occasion a native chief gave him some land on which to build a College, he said—

> "I give you this land as a site for a place of education for the youth of both races, that they may grow up together in the new principles of the faith of Jesus Christ, and in obedience to the Queen."

That, he would undertake to say, was the prevailing feeling throughout the whole of New Zealand. Every New Zealander desired to be a faithful subject of Her Majesty until that unfortunate article of the treaty of Waitangi, the Queen's right to the pre-emption of land, took the precedence over every other idea, and the whole notion of government and of the sovereignty of the Queen was lost in the simple question of in what manner and by what quickest possible means the property of the soil in New Zealand should be transferred from the natives to the Crown. Their great mistake in New Zealand had been their asserting from the beginning a sovereignty over a country which they could not govern. Within a few years they had repeated all the errors committed in Ireland centuries ago. There had been repeated confiscations of land, large tracts had been taken from the natives, and so-called military settlers were placed in them to defend the district. These military settlers speedily sold their lands. On one occasion he knew that a dealer came to those settlements and bought up in one day the land of thirty of those supposed defenders of the country, who went away leaving the place unprotected; and then a number of peaceful settlers came instead of those military men, and scattered themselves over the district, and although they were exposed to every kind of danger they were never injured, because they were living in the King's country and the King's word was for peace. In other parts, indeed, where peculiarly exasperating circumstances had occurred, the case had been different. The men who had done all the mischief on the East Coast and at Poverty Bay were men who had been carried off as prisoners to the Chatham Islands. They were told that if they conducted themselves well at the end of two years they would be set at liberty. They behaved in the most exemplary manner that they might earn their freedom; but at the expiration of the two years they were informed that they were not to be set at liberty. The magistrate who was instructed to read this dispatch to them had asked a friend to watch the countenance of the prisoners as he read the letter. A look of despair at once came over them, as if every hope they had in life were cut off. They had been placed on lonely and remote islands, 600 miles away; they had looked forward to the day of their emancipation, and with that view they had behaved exceedingly well. But when they saw no hope left to them, was it surprising that they took matters into their own hands, seized a ship, and escaped? Those men went back to their own country: they offered to remain quiet if they were let alone; but they were followed up by a military force, driven into the woods, their places stormed, and their houses burnt. The most unwise thing of all was that, in spite of warning, the military officers who had followed up those escaped prisoners went and settled down on the land which had just been taken from them. The New Zealanders would not be like the Scotch, the Irish, or the Welsh if, under such circumstances, they had not taken their revenge. He trusted that none of their Lordships would believe that the New Zealanders were naturally a cruel and treacherous race. There were, no doubt, a few murderers among them at the present moment under the force of circumstances; but there was not one cannibal among them, except when, stimulated by frenzy or goaded on by a false prophet, they acted under the same maddened impulses that led French women during the frenzy of the Revolution to lap the blood of persons who had been decapitated by the guillotine. When maddened by the influence of some fanatic, some excesses of that kind might, perhaps, have been committed by a native New Zealander; but as to cannibalism in the real sense of the term, which was sometimes gravely charged against them, and at other times, he grieved to say, alleged against them in order merely to point a jest, such a thing had entirely ceased since the colony was established. He therefore appealed to Her Majesty's Government to give some assistance to New Zealand. He thought it might be done in two ways. He hoped that the use of the Imperial credit might be extended to the Colonial Government to enable it to raise a loan on reasonable terms for one simple purpose—namely, to compensate the settlers who must be removed from the disturbed districts for a time, because their remaining there was likely to provoke a continuance of these murders. Another way in which he hoped New Zealand would receive some assistance was in the maintenance of a small force to act as a police force—because he did not think the Colonial Government ever could maintain such a force as was necessary to follow up and suppress brigandage and murder. The native who had lately murdered a missionary was now at large, and was known to be living some twenty or thirty miles from our frontier settlements on the Waikato river; and, after the expenditure of millions of money and the loss of the lives of so many British officers and soldiers, no attempt had been made to bring to justice that notorious murderer. If that man and other notorious murderers were once given up to justice, and if we once made a treaty of peace with the New Zealanders, there was nothing in our experience of the country before or since its colonization to warrant the belief that any solemn covenant entered into with them would ever be broken. He thought that it would be very beneficial if, instead of the regiment now shut up in the towns, a flying body of about 500 men, under the authority of the British Government, yet acting in conjunction with the Colonial Government of New Zealand, were held ready at any moment to go to any part of the colony wherever a crime had been committed—not in any way to protect the settlers in the possession of the land, nor to be mixed up at all with the land question, but merely to arrest murderers; and he believed that such criminals would be apprehended with the good will of the native population themselves. He was convinced that the colonists, instead of looking to some other Power for the protection which might be denied them by England, would far rather cling to this country, as they had ever yet clung to it as their own mother, their own friend, and their own protector. He did not ask for assistance to enable the colonists to do acts of injustice towards the natives. Such acts, he must say in defence of his own brother-settlers, had not been attempted excepting on very rare occasions. The general feeling of the settlers, he could assure their Lordships, had been for many years that of friendliness towards the native race. There were a few persons among the settlers, as there were also a few among the New Zealanders, who would, at times, rush into violence; but the great majority of the colonists lived in peace and harmony with their native fellow-subjects, and their good will was, in a great degree, reciprocated by the natives.

He, therefore, entreated Her Majesty's Government to pause before committing themselves finally to the principle that, under no circumstances, would they depart from the rigid policy of entire abstinence in future from any interference in the affairs of New Zealand; and he made that appeal to them on the ground of mercy both to the settlers and to the natives.

LORD LYVEDEN said, the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) who had opened the debate, in a speech remarkable for its moderation, had stated that there was nothing the colonists so much disliked as indifference. His own experience was that they did dislike indifference. But let the House look at this debate, and see to what all the difficulties which had been spoken of would lead. It would lead to so many things the colonists would dislike that he feared very much they would prefer our indifference. Even the noble Earl himself mentioned two things which would give rise to great difference of opinion in the colony. The one was that our acknowledgment of the independence of the colony was premature, and the other, that our giving up the native tribes to the colonists was also premature. Mr. Fitzherbert, in a letter to his noble Friend the Secretary for the Colonies, stated that in the beginning there was a great determination on the part of Government to establish the colony, and great encouragement was given to induce people to go out and settle there. But his noble Friend said, very properly, in his answer, that a number of Englishmen, without any encouragement from the Government, took upon themselves to form one or more settlements in the colony of New Zealand, and the Government of the day only thought it their duty to place the relations between the settlers and the natives upon a safe and honourable basis. And not only was that true—not only was it true that the Government gave no encouragement whatever to the settlers, but they gave them discouragement. The New Zealand Company were determined to establish themselves in New Zealand, whether under the authority of the Crown or any other authority, and they planned all sorts of schemes to induce people to go out. But so little encouragement was held out by the Government that only this morning, in looking over some despatches of that time, he found a letter addressed to himself as Under Secretary of the Colonies on the part of the Company, in which he was informed that they would write to him no more, his tone was so discouraging, but it was their desire to see Lord Russell himself, under whom he served at the time. But Lord Russell gave the same answer as he had done—so that the fact was that they had met with discouragement from the Government, instead of encouragement. He agreed with the noble Earl that it would be idle now to enter into old questions of disputes, in which General Cameron, Sir George Grey, and others took part. At present the only question was whether we were to pursue a particular line of policy or not. Nothing could have been more interesting or instructive than the speech of the right rev. Prelate, who had spent almost all his life in the colony. But what were his proposals, and what had he said? He said that the Imperial Government had made a treaty with the natives, and that it had been departed from. But was it really the case that it had been departed from? for he (Lord Lyveden) did not know in what respect. Then the right rev. Prelate asked to have loans made to the colonists; but for what? To carry out the policy which the right rev. Prelate himself so strongly condemned as injurious to the Maories. If the right rev. Prelate had attacked any one, it was the Colonial Government that he had attacked. No doubt the policy of self-reliance was an excellent policy; but it was a miserable policy if, whenever a difficulty arose, it called out for "Help, help." If, now, because of the horrible massacre at Poverty Bay, and other calamities of the kind, the colonists were to come to the Imperial Government and say—"We can no longer rely upon ourselves, and must now come to you," it would put an end to responsible government altogether. The noble Earl opposite had suggested to send out a Commission—

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he had not suggested that a Commission should be sent out, but that some person accredited by Her Majesty's Government should be sent out to make inquiries on the spot.

LORD LYVEDEN said, the noble Earl must remember that every inquiry, whether conducted by a single person or otherwise, must give rise to new hopes and expectations, the effect of which would be to a great extent to make the government of the colony still more difficult. Every inquiry on the spot must, to a great extent, supersede the authority of the Governor; and when once the authority of the Governor was superseded, not only the settlers, but the natives would come to think that their friend the Queen was taking their part against the Governor—so that every chance of the pacification of the colony would be overturned. There was one suggestion which he thought might be acted on by his noble Friend, and that was to enter into some negotiation with the Maori King. With regard to money and troops, he hoped his noble Friend would not recede from his original determination. He imagined that by this time all the troops had left New Zealand. [Earl GRANVILLE assented.] A loan had been already guaranteed to New Zealand, and he saw no reason why there should be any other guarantee. The colonists must be left to themselves to work out their own safety. No doubt that might be a very great difficulty, but it was one which they must meet, and which they would never meet as long as we sent them troops. If the settlers were left to their own resources he could not help thinking that those in the Southern Island, who had not hitherto been so active as the rest, would combine with their brethren in the north to put down the insurrection. With the stern determination of British men in them, and the resolution to use their best endeavours to promote the interests of the colony and defend themselves, he could not but think that we might look forward in a short time to the prosperity of New Zealand—as one of those favourite colonies in which Englishmen at home, from the Sovereign down to the pauper emigrant, felt the greatest interest, and which was regarded as one of our noblest colonies, and one which afforded to all emigrants the greatest advantages for settlement.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (INDIA).

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS.

EARL FORTESCUE, in moving an Address for Copies of Correspondence relating to Weights and Measures (India), said, that he wished to draw attention to the valuable Report which had been laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday last. He advocated the adoption of the metric system in India in preference to our complicated method of measuring, because then the people of India would have no difficulty in the way of trading with all the civilized world.

Moved for—

Address for Copy of despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, of the 6th November 1868, relating to Weights and Measures for India, omitting enclosures: Also,

Correspondence between the India Office and the Board of Trade on the same subject, omitting enclosures, with the exception of a minute by Mr. H. T. Prinsep, Member of the Indian Council, and of a letter from the Warden of the Standards; also further minutes by Mr. Prinsep: And also,

Copy of despatch from the Secretary of State to the Government of India, dated 10th June 1869, omitting enclosures.—(*The Earl Fortescue.*)

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, there was no objection to the presentation of the Papers. A short time ago a despatch was received from the Government of India explaining that the weights and measures of that country were in an extremely confused state, and recommending that the metric system should be adopted throughout India. He had much pleasure in sending out a despatch permitting the adoption of the metric system. One of the Papers moved for consisted of a dissent from the course by Mr. Prinsep, a Member of the Indian Council, who had, some time since, taken a distinguished part in reforming Indian weights and measures; but he was alone in his opposition.

Motion *agreed to.*

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for the separation of the Straits Settlements from the Diocese of Calcutta—Was *presented* by The Earl GRANVILLE; read 1ª. (No. 231.)

MILLBANK PRISON BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to enable military offenders to be confined in Millbank Prison—Was *presented* by The Lord NORTHBROOK; read 1ª. (No. 234.)

House adjourned at half past Seven
o'clock, to Thursday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 27th July, 1869.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report* — Salmon Fisheries [No. 361]; General Valuation, &c. (Ireland) [No. 362].
Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [July 26] *reported.*
Public Bills — *Committee*—Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [215]—r.p.
Third Reading—Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * [53], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

INDIA—RAILWAY EXTENSION.

QUESTION.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, If the Railway to Darjeeling has been recommended by the Government of India; and, if so, whether it is to be an extension of the East India Railway from Rajmahal, or of the Eastern Bengal Line of Railway from Kooshtea?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: In reply, Sir, to my hon. Friend, I have to say that an extension of the Eastern Bengal Railway to Darjeeling has been recommended by the Government of India, and that the Secretary of State in Council has sanctioned a preliminary survey of that line from Kooshtea.

NAVY—CHANNEL AND MEDITERRANEAN FLEETS.—QUESTION.

Captain EGERTON said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the present Board of Admiralty have considered the proposal understood to have been contemplated by their predecessors, of bringing together the Channel and Mediterranean Fleets during a part of the summer months.

Mr. CHILDERS: In reply, Sir, to my hon. and gallant Friend, I have to say that, although I have no official information on the subject, I have reason to believe that the late Board of Admiralty had this proposal before them, and received it favourably; but I imagine that there was some difficulty in carrying it out in consequence of the two Commanders-in-Chief being Vice Admirals of nearly the same standing, and of the objection which might be felt to place one under the orders of the other. We are much impressed with the advantage of bringing the two fleets together for some weeks, and we have it in contemplation, if the state of Public Business permits, to get over the difficulty I have alluded to by my gallant Friend (Sir Sydney Dacres) and myself going out with the Channel Fleet towards the end of August, hoisting the Admiralty flag in the flag-ship—or one of the ships of the squadron—and joining the Mediterranean Fleet at Gibraltar for a cruize.

SCOTLAND—WATERNISH CHURCH.

QUESTION.

Mr. CAMERON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will inform the House upon what authority he admitted the accuracy of a statement to the effect that the attendance in the quoad sacra parish church of Waternish, Isle of Skye, consists of only two old men; and, whether his attention has been drawn to a counter statement, that the congregation in that church varies from thirty to 120; that more Baptisms and other ordinances of the Church have been hitherto performed by the minister of the parish than by any clergyman of another denomination; and that if a young man were settled there the attendance in the parish church might vie with that of many congregations in the North?

Mr. BRUCE said, in reply, that the statement he made was based upon the authority of a Petition which was signed by 194 male residents in the parish. It contained the signatures of the only two heritors in the parish One was Mr. Gordon M'Leod, and the other a gentleman personally known to himself. The Petition contained the statement that the whole population were members of the Free Church, with the exception of two old men; one of whom was over seventy, and the other over sixty, who availed themselves of all favourable opportunities of attending the preaching of the Free Church ministers. He was bound to say that his hon. Friend had furnished him with a statement of a clergyman who had preached in the parish—to the effect that the congregation occasionally numbered from sixty to 120. Since then he had received a letter from Mr. Gordon M'Leod, saying that the attendance on certain special occasions reached ten or twelve, five or six of whom consisted of the minister's family. It was impossible for him to reconcile this conflict of testimony, and he could only give both statements.

SCOTLAND—THE CUMBRAE LIGHTS. QUESTION.

MR. GRIEVE said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that the revenue of the Cumbrae Lights, in the River Clyde, which arises from tolls upon shipping, amounted in the year ending 31st May 1869, to £9,710 13*s.* 8*d*, whilst the expenditure for maintenance and management of the Lights amounted only to £1,341 7*s.* 9*d*, and that the surplus, amounting to £8,369 5*s.* 11*d.*, is divided between the Glasgow and Greenock Harbour Trusts in the proportions of five-sixths and one-sixth respectively; and, whether the Board of Trade can take any steps to put a stop to this anomalous state of things?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Sir, the attention of the Board of Trade has been called to the subject the hon. Member has referred to, and I believe he has correctly stated the application of the Clyde Light Dues under the authority of a local Act. I need hardly say that the policy advocated by the Board of Trade for many years past has been entirely opposed to such anomalies, and if the parties locally interested will bring before Parliament a fair and reasonable measure for putting an end to it the Board of Trade will render them any assistance it can.

INDIA—ROUTE TO CHINA, &c. QUESTION.

MR. BAINES said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he objects to lay upon the Table of the House, Papers relating to the route of Captain W. C. McLeod, from Moulmein to the frontiers of China, and to the route of Dr. Richardson on his fourth mission to the Shan provinces of Burma, or Extracts from the same?

MR. GRANT DUFF: Sir, my attention having been called to the documents by an hon. Member, I found that, so far back as 1867, Colonel Yule wrote of them in the following terms:—

> "As the only modern records of visits to the obscure regions of which they treat, and the sole trustworthy materials for their geography, surely they ought to be published."

I have little doubt that, if the events of the Mutiny had not called off the attention of the Indian Government from the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, Colonel Yule's suggestion would have been followed up; and now, in happier times, I am glad to be able to show my respect for the opinion of that very distinguished man by laying the Papers on the table of the House.

DIVIDENDS ON GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.—QUESTION,

MR. KINNAIRD said, he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, If it is proposed to change the system of paying the Dividends on Government Securities by the Bank of England, and to remit, as in the case of Railway and other Companies, Dividend Warrants to the holders of such stocks?

MR. AYRTON, in reply, said, his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has under consideration the proposal to change the system of paying the dividends on Government securities by the Bank of England. Legislation will be necessary, however, to effect a change of that extent.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 215] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. CAMPBELL, who had given notice to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, no system of education will be effectual or just which, while involving compulsory rating, does not include the power of enforcing the attendance of children at school,"

said: Sir, I think it is very much to be regretted that this important Bill—the most important Bill that can be brought forward for Scotland—comes before us at so advanced a period of the Session that we can only be promised one day for its discussion, and on that account, having no desire by a side wind to defeat the main object of the measure, I do not intend to persevere with the Motion of which I have given Notice, and which stands in my name upon the Paper. But I think the question of such importance that I hope the House will excuse me if, in a very few words, I state what I think to be the facts of the case with regard to Scotland, without going into the general question of compulsory education. I may say that there is the greatest mistake as to the state of feeling in Scotland on this subject. In general, we, who are in favour of compulsory education, are told that it is impracticable. Now, that may be true in two or three ways. It may be impracticable to pass a measure involving such clauses through the two Houses of Parliament. Of that I am no judge. But this I may say, that it would receive the support of a great number of representatives from Scotland. Then we may be told that it is impracticable, because it is opposed by the general feeling of Scotland. Now, I can assure the House that that is not the case. As far as my experience goes, I believe our countrymen in the North are far too shrewd to be misled by any fear of the horrors attendant on compulsory education, and the interference which it is supposed to create with the liberty of the subject. They have only to look to another part of Europe, where a people very similar to themselves in every respect—I mean the Swiss—have introduced this system some twenty or thirty years ago, and compulsory education has now become so incorporated with their national life that they accept it with the greatest pleasure; and so much is that the case, that I find, from the reports which have been received through the Foreign Office from Switzerland, that the penalties attached to the system are now never required to be enforced, so readily do the people embrace it. Then, on the other hand, we are constantly asked how are we to introduce the machinery to work the system? This point seems to have been the stumbling-block in the way of the Commissioners, for they say that it is difficult to devise the means. Now, I cannot conceive that it is very difficult, seeing that compulsory education exists in some of the United States, in Prussia, in Saxony, in Baden, in Austria—in fact, in all the States of Central Europe, and, as I have already stated, in Switzerland, which is, perhaps, the most apposite example of all, because they are a perfectly free people, and are in no way under a military despotism. I lay stress not upon any high-flown or fantastic theories of the duties of the State. I merely say, in a Bill like this, in which power is taken to exact rates from all inhabitants in support of education, you are bound to furnish the rate-payers with a guarantee that the object for which the money is raised is attained. I consider it absolutely unjust to do otherwise. What is the case with regard to Scotland? We are told that it is most necessary and urgently important to pass this measure this year, because there are 90,000 children who are not receiving education. How many of these children are there in Glasgow? In the largest city of Scotland there are 60,000 of them, and I think it must be patent to everybody that the great bulk of these will belong to a class of children who will not be affected by any measure which does not include compulsory clauses. Build as many schools as you like, and provide as many schoolmasters as you choose; but if you have not the power to take those children to the schools it will be useless. I would express my regret, which I know is shared by several other hon. Members, and which I know is the general feeling in Scotland, that in this great and important Bill, which is intended to be a great step in advance in the educational history of Scotland, the most important part of the measure has been overlooked.

MR. STAPLETON said, he wished before the Bill proceeded any farther to call the attention of the House to a matter in connection with it which he regarded as of a constitutional character. He alluded to the manner in which the Bill was brought before the House. It came down to them from the other House. He thought it should have been introduced in the House of Commons. Of course, he was aware that the House of Lords could in strictness of law initiate any Bill except a Money Bill; but he thought that for the Government to bring a Bill of this sort—a Bill concerning education — a Bill therefore affecting the social interests of the people—in the other House, was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. It appeared to him that it was not fair to either House. The other House was not in that intimate relation with the people which they were. They had no means of ascertaining the feelings, the wishes, or the opinion of the people. However anxious they might be to do their duty they could not feel the pulse of the people. When a Bill went up to the other House from this House the other House discharged its proper function — that of reviewing their decision, with the advantage of knowing what had been done in the House of Commons. By knowing what had been done by the representatives of the people in that House they knew, in a constitutional way the feelings and wishes of the people. Had this Bill been introduced into the House of Commons, as he contended that it should, and then gone before the House of Lords for the first time, they might have deferred to the opinion of the people expressed through the House of Commons in that, as they had done in other things. They could have done it more easily than they could do it now, for now they had expressed their opinion, and the matter was prejudged. Neither was it fair to this House. They had a right to expect that Government would bring before them such measures only as it approved and could recommend. It was of the very essence of the Constitution that the Government should be in harmony with the majority of that House; therefore that it should only bring forward such measures as it had reason to believe would be acceptable to the majority on which it rested in that House. But this Bill when it came down to this House was the Bill of the Government no more. It had become the Bill of the Opposition; because the Opposition had a majority in the House of Lords, and they had availed themselves of that majority to re-model this Bill during its passage through that House. The Lord Advocate felt the difficulty. He could not recommend the Bill as it came down from the other House as a Government measure. He got the House to allow the Bill to be committed *pro formâ*, in order that he might alter the Bill which had been sent down to them so as to bring it back somewhat nearer its original form, and then take the discussion, on the re-committal of the Bill, which, in the ordinary course of things, would have taken place on the second reading. But this mode of proceeding produced a fresh complication. The Bill which had come down to them was set aside and a fresh Bill substituted for it. The learned Lord became dependent on his opponents. For unless they brought forward the principles of the Amendments made in the House of Lords, the Lords would say that their views had never been presented to the House of Commons; that Amendments which they had fully considered and carefully prepared, involving principles to which they attached great value had never been considered in the House of Commons, but had been set aside without discussion and without deliberation. Under those circumstances he did not think the Bill when it had passed their House would have much chance of being accepted by the other House of Parliament. Instead of gaining time by the course they had pursued he feared the result would be that all their labours over this Bill would be in vain. But he must say he did not attribute the blame of this wholly to the Government. He well remembered that, at an early period of the Session, there was a discussion on the advisability of dividing the business between the two Houses. Members on both sides took part in it, and he remembered an hon. Friend of his, an advanced Liberal, recommending that some of the important measures of the Session should be initiated in the House of Lords. He regretted that advice had been taken. He had mentioned this matter in the hope that, before another Session, the Government would consider of some means by which these complications might be avoided, and the services of the House of Lords rendered available in the early part of the Session. It was not for him to point out the means—certainly not then—it was enough to say that there were means.

Mr. MILLER said, he was glad the hon. Member for Stirling (Mr. Campbell) had brought the question of compulsory education before the House. Great as was the importance he attached to this Bill, it was nothing compared with that with which he would have regarded it if compulsory education had been included in it. At the last election he had the opportunity of bringing this question repeatedly before large bodies of the working classes among his constituents—those who would be most affected by a power of compulsory education—and they were unanimously in favour of compulsory education. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would take the question up, and that, if not in the present Bill, then at the earliest opportunity afterwards, they would take steps towards effecting so desirable an object.

MR. HIBBERT, as an English Member, desired to say that, as this Bill was likely to be in some measure a precedent for the English Bill which was promised them next year, he trusted the Government would pluck up courage, and would not be afraid to introduce a clause into the English Bill compelling the attendance of children at school. The feeling of the working classes was decidedly in favour of compulsory attendance. It was only the ignorant and the drunken who would be brought under the penalties of such a system, and it was in their case that it was most desirable.

COLONEL SYKES, in confirmation of the statements which have been made, begged to state, that when addressing his constituents in November last, he found the working classes of Aberdeen unanimous in favour of compulsory education.

MR. GRAHAM said, that not long ago he attended an Educational Conference in Manchester, at which resolutions were unanimously carried that compulsory education must form part of any satisfactory educational measure. From that Conference he proceeded to Glasgow, where a great public meeting was held, and from what he then learned, and had since learned, he might say that the desire in Scotland, and especially in Glasgow, that there should be a system of compulsory education, was as strong there as it was at Manchester. A few days since he received a letter from the Glasgow Working Men's Association, in which they said that no Bill would be satisfactory to them unless made compulsory, and they asked him rather to hinder the progress of the measure than otherwise, provided compulsory clauses were not inserted in it. His reply was that he could not do that because he thought that this Bill contained something which was valuable apart from the question of compulsory education. Although, therefore, he quite approved of the course taken by the hon. Member for Stirling (Mr. Campbell) in withdrawing his Motion, it ought to be perfectly understood by the House that the people of Scotland were exceedingly anxious to have compulsory clauses carried in the course of next year.

LORD GARLIES said, he did not propose to discuss the question of compulsory education, inasmuch as the Question before them was that the House should go into Committee on this Bill. But he wished to call attention to the course which the Government had pursued with regard to the Bill. It was introduced in the Speech from the Throne in February last; and now, nearly six months afterwards, on the 27th of July, they were practically asked to read the Bill a second time. They were told that the Bill would be introduced into the other House, and, no doubt, some delay took place from their Lordships' desire to discover, from what took place from the May meetings in Scotland, what was the general wish of the people of that country on the subject. The Bill was carried through the Committee of the House of Lords on the 10th of June, and was sent down to this House on the 14th of June. When it was brought forward in this House, a fortnight ago, it was brought in at midnight, and then the Lord Advocate — who, he felt convinced, was only "riding to orders," because nobody was more anxious to pass the Bill than he was — told them that there was a compact entered into that there should be no discussion on the second reading—he did not tell us by whom that compact had been made—and, further, that it had been arranged that the discussion should be taken when the Bill was in Committee. He (Lord Garlies) had already absolved the Lord Advocate as regards the delay in bringing in this Bill into this House; but he could not absolve him for the course he had since pursued. He (Lord Garlies) understood on that night—and it was also understood by many other hon. Members —that the Bill was to be read a second time as it came from the other House; and that, when in Committee, it was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman to bring forward those matters to which the Government objected as regarded the action of the House of Lords. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had not violated the strict letter of the law in having acted as he had done, in restoring at once the Bill to the shape it stood when originally introduced; but he thought the course which had been pursued might not improperly be described as "a right and left hander" in the face of both Houses. The right hon.

Gentleman did not propose to go into Committee on the Bill which came from the House of Lords, but he asked them to go into Committee on another Bill altogether. He had been assured by many hon. Gentlemen on both sides that the course which had been taken was quite unprecedented; and that, although not in the letter, yet in the spirit, it was neither formal nor constitutional.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, there was a time when he thought there was a chance of an Education Bill for Scotland being passed this Session. But all those hopes were dashed by the answer of the Home Secretary to the Question of the hon. Member for Invernessshire (Mr. Cameron) last night, that no second day could be given to this Bill till after Supply should have been disposed of. When they were asked to read this Bill a second time *sub silentio*, it was on the understanding that they were to have an opportunity of discussing it on going into Committee. Then he (Mr. Craufurd) hoped that they should have some statement from the Government of what they meant to do in Committee, what Amendments they proposed to adhere to, and what changes they yet proposed to make in the Bill. There had been three meetings of Scotch Members, each of which lasted for several hours, and yet they were not enabled to get through all the clauses of this Bill. They had now had three Bills—first, the Bill as it was introduced by the Government in the House of Lords—then the Bill as it was sent down from the House of Lords—and now a third Bill to go into Committee upon. How was it to be supposed, then, that they would get through it on that one day's sitting, with only five hours to discuss it in? He did not deny the competency of the Lord Advocate to take the course he had done in going into Committee *pro formâ;* but if the noble Lord, or any other hon. Member, objected, the objection should have been taken at that time. It did not lie with him to do so now.

Lord GARLIES said he did not understand the Motion at the time, or else he should have objected.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he had distinctly stated what his intention was in the speech which he made upon the second reading.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, he could support that statement of the Lord Advocate. He did say in his speech on the second reading that he would present the Bill in the shape which the Government intended it to take. But he complained that that promise was not now to be adhered to, and they were in utter ignorance—he meant official ignorance—of what the Amendments of the Lord Advocate were to be. The Bill was first proposed as a national Bill; it came down from the House of Lords a denominational Bill; and now it was a mongrel mixture of national and denominational—and denominational chiefly in favour of one sect—which would leave in the future to Scotch Members and to Parliament a little Maynooth agitation to the end of their days. It might be said that the Irish Church Bill had stopped the progress of this Bill; but the fact was that this Bill came down to this House just as the Irish Church Bill left it; and here they were now, on the 27th July, with only one day, with a sitting of five hours—one of which is already gone—to discuss a Bill of sixty clauses, and about fifteen pages of Amendments. If the Government really desired to pass the Bill, and had put their heart into it, they would have dealt with it as they did with the Bankruptcy Bill, or the Contagious (Animals) Diseases Bill, or the Telegraphs Bill. He would remind the House that the Bill contained matters of vital importance to the people of Scotland, and that it was utterly impossible to proceed to the discussion of it without a clear indication of the course that the Government intended to pursue. There were two main points—the constitution of the Central Board, and the question of the 66th clause, upon which he hoped the Government would give them an intimation that they intended to revert to the original plan. It was of vital importance that they should know how the Central Board was to be constituted; and he thought it hardly right that all the powers now proposed should be given to a Board sitting at Edinburgh. His right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate entertained, he knew, a different opinion on the question of the constitution of the Board or Commission. He did not quarrel with him in that respect; but he regretted that he had misunderstood the object he had in view in calling attention to the constitution of the Board. The right hon. and learned Lord had said that he wanted to establish the central management in London. That was utterly to mistake his object. He (Mr. Craufurd) stated, on the second reading, that the Board ought to be a Scotch Board; that it ought to have the control of education in Scotland, in accordance with the wishes of the Scotch people; and that it was not well that, as would be the case as the Bill now stood, the whole control, power, and management should be in the Privy Council. But the Government had rejected even the proposition of the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire (Mr. Orr Ewing) that the Central Board in Scotland should be allowed to act in conjunction with the Privy Council, in framing the Code — they were told that the Privy Council would not submit to even such a modification of the Bill. He would ask who was really in favour of centralization — the learned Lord or himself? He desired that the Central Board should be truly a Scotch Board, and that its members should be properly paid men, intended to devote their whole attention to it, and not with the niggardly payment of £500 or £600 a year. Why, he found that our Fiscals were paid more than that, though they were not required to devote the whole of their time to their public duties, and were allowed to continue their private professional practice. He did not wish to see a Board sitting at Edinburgh simply to administer the wishes and views of the Privy Council, and to have no independent control. His right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate admitted that we ought to have a Scotch Board. He suggested that there was an opportunity of placing the matter on a proper footing for constituting a really effective Board in Edinburgh. He repeated he had no wish to bring the Board to London; but he did desire that there should be some one here responsible to this House who should control the action of the Board—not the Chairman or any of the working members, but some one here with power to control the action of the Privy Council, and to see that in drawing up the Code one shall be constructed, not fitted to a country like England—which everyone now admitted to be far behind Scotland in education — but a Code that should suit the wants and necessities of the present state of education in Scotland. Upon this matter they had received either refusals or utter disregard of their wishes, or the assertion that such a state of things only tended to the establishment of a centralization in London, and was not for the benefit of the Scotch people. He had hoped that now they had a Scotch Member as Secretary of State for the Home Department, he would have felt it to be necessary to give a really Scotch tendency to this Bill—to give them the real control over the education of the country, without which he was sure the Scotch people would rather see no Bill at all passed this Session. Now he was most anxious that they should not have to go back to their constituents and say they had done nothing in the matter of education for them; but he maintained that it was not right or even discreet to the House and to themselves that they should pass this measure in a hurry and without due consideration, merely that they might be able to say that they had passed it. But if it could be brought into conformity with the main principles on which this legislation ought to rest, if it would give them a thoroughly national system of education, and a thoroughly Scotch Board, he would be quite willing to waive all matters of minor detail.

MR. BRUCE rose to make an appeal to the House. He entreated hon. Gentlemen to go into Committee. He believed that the general feeling of the Scotch Members was that, on the whole, the Bill was deserving of their support, but if hon. Members who thought they had grounds of objection, took this opportunity of enlarging on the subject, the time which could be given to the discussion of the Bill would be entirely absorbed. It was undoubtedly a misfortune that the necessities of the Session obliged the Government to introduce the Bill in the House of Lords, and that the necessities of the Government compelled this House to occupy its chief time with Bills that had to be sent to the Lords, so as to postpone the consideration of this measure to so late a period. But there was a most earnest desire on the part of the Government to carry the Bill. He had not at all intended to imply a doubt that another day for the consideration of the Bill would be forthcoming, if necessary. What he said, was, that at this period of the Session it was absolutely necessary that they should get through Committee of Supply and that, until Supply was finished, it was impossible to give a fixed day for the Bill. The hon. Member (Mr. Craufurd) had hinted that it was the object of the Government to give to the Scotch system of education an English character by keeping it under the control of the Privy Council. Now he was bound to say that the Members of the Government had—in his opinion, very wisely, but at some pains, and at some sacrifice of preconceived opinions — abandoned some of the leading principles of the Revised Code in this Bill, in order to meet the wishes of the Scotch Members. They had abandoned the limitation of payments to particular classes and the limits of age prescribed by the Revised Code, and, by so doing, had shown their determination to preserve that most important principle of Scotch education by which all classes were educated together, and under the influence of which every Scotch peasant and every individual of the nation endeavoured to keep his children at school as long as possible; and while, in certain respects, a limited control was reserved to the Privy Council, yet large powers were given to the Central Board, and the wishes of the Scotch people had been, and would be, consulted as to the principles on which Scotch education should be based. Under these circumstances he hoped that, without wasting further time in preliminary discussions, they would at once address themselves to the Bill, so that they might be able, during this Session, to confer upon the people of Scotland the lasting benefit of passing this Bill into law.

Mr. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said he had listened to the words of the right hon. Gentleman with great astonishment. Yesterday he made a statement which was considered fatal to the passing of the measure this Session; for when asked when he would give another day for the discussion, he said that that would depend upon the progress that was made with Supply. To-day the right hon. Gentleman got up to urge them not to discuss the principles of the Bill, but to get into Committee on it. What was the meaning of that, but that the Session could not be wound up until the money was voted, and that after it was obtained the Session would not be prolonged? It seemed to him that if the Government were sincerely anxious to pass the Bill, the proper course would be to sacrifice a few more days of August. Was it to go forth to the constituencies that their representatives were so extremely impatient to leave town that thep were unwilling, even on a measure of this great importance, to stay for a few days more? Besides the Bill itself there were fifteen pages of Amendments. Two days more, at least, would be required to discuss them. Would any Member of the Government say that those two days should be given? He asked that they should have from the Government a distinct intimation of their intention. If they were willing to make a sacrifice of a few days for the sake of passing the Bill, he ventured to say—though, of course, he was not authorized to speak for anybody but himself — that the Scotch Members would cheerfully defer their departure from town for the necessary time. It was monstrous to suppose that the Bill could pass without due discussion. There were two clauses on which he wished to offer a remark. There was the 2nd clause, appointing Commissioners to be paid by the Crown, and the 66th clause, which contained the proviso that when the Board, nominated by the Crown, should see fit to make a recommendation to the Privy Council that a denominational grant should be given, the Privy Council was to make such grant to denominational schools. Now, that completely destroyed the character of the measure as an undenominational Bill. It becomes a really denominational Bill, call it by what name you would; for it provided the machinery for making denominational grants upon the action of a Government Department. It would be far better that, if it is to be done at all, the thing should be done openly. The provision would keep up perpetual agitation on the subject. It was perfectly well known that the proviso was inserted in order to meet the wishes of the Roman Catholics; that it had been introduced not to satisfy the people of Scotland, but of a part of the people of Ireland. For his own part, he must express his extreme disapprobation of the proviso, and unless they were to have the means of freely discussing the Bill, he did not think it was to be desired that it should pass.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, it was absolutely necessary that the Members for Scotland should know exactly what was settled, and how they stood in this matter. The case at present was this—that upon the most important measure, as affecting Scotland, that had been introduced for 200 years, there had been absolutely no discussion of any shape or kind in regard to its principles. Now, the Lord Advocate undertook that there should be a general discussion upon the Motion for going into Committee. Now, however, the Home Secretary appeals to us in the most urgent language to get into Committee without delay, and without any discussion on the principles of the measure. If it appeared to him that the Amendments were such as promised to bring the Bill at all into the form in which the people of Scotland would wish it to be, he would readily stay in town as long as might be necessary; but he had no sort of hope that any such substantial or *boná fide* Amendments, of a kind to satisfy the constituencies of Scotland, would be introduced.

MR. M'LAREN said, that when the Bill was read the second time, not only was the appeal made by the Government that there should be very little discussion, but the distinct promise was given that on going into Committee the discussion on the general principles should take place; and now we have been entreated not to engage in a general discussion. But hon. Gentlemen knew very well that when they went into Committee on a Bill their observations were limited to the particular clause under discussion, and they were very properly called to Order if they wandered into wider questions. On the other hand, he did not think it was possible to discuss the details of this measure satisfactorily until they had arrived at some sort of understanding as to its leading principles. On the second reading, the Lord Advocate explained the character of a number of Amendments which he intended to propose; and the Bill passed through Committee *pro forma,* in order that they might be embodied in it. Now, if the same course were to be adopted on the present occasion—if the Government were to tell them what further Amendments they intended to propose—not, of course, as to all the details, but the principal ones—the House would be in a position to say at once whether they were prepared to pass the Bill with these Amendments, or to pass it as it stood. He must say that if the question were to be put to him whether he would accept the Bill as it passed through Committee *pro formá,* he should most distinctly say "No." He would not have the Bill in that state. If it was to be altered, why not tell them now, as they were told on the second reading, the character and principle of the alterations proposed to be made? He was most anxious that a Bill on this subject should pass; but he repeated that if the only question was to be whether to pass this Bill substantially unaltered, he said it would be better to have no Bill at all. Less than three and a-half hours remained of this Sitting, and there were on the Paper 139 Amendments and thirty-nine new clauses? How could these Amendments and clauses possibly be discussed each in a couple of minutes? He had himself given notice of two only out of the 139 Amendments, so that he did not contemplate taking up much of the time of the House; but one of them was of great importance—that regarding the question of denominational schools. He would stay in London as long as the Government desired; but he should like to know what their intentions were with regard to the amendment of this Bill.

MR. DALGLISH quite agreed with the hon. Member for Edinburgh. He was prepared to stay in London as long as was necessary to pass this Bill, but he should like to have some assurance—if the Government were able to give them such assurance—that if the Scotch Members, at a great sacrifice of time and trouble, put this Bill into a shape that would meet the views of the people of Scotland, such a Bill so amended and sent to the other House would have the least chance of passing.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, the Government seemed to him to have taken an extraordinary and erratic course with regard to this Bill. It was clear that there had been a misunderstanding, but how this misunderstanding arose he was at a loss to make out. Some hon. Gentlemen had objected to this Bill because it is a national denominational Bill. To him that appeared to be one of its main advantages. It would be impossible to have a purely national system for Scotland, unless they made it a secular system, which he did not believe the people of Scotland wished. He thought, too, that the question of the 2*d.* rate was rather difficult to understand. He did not see how it was to work.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he certainly would not deny that hon. Gentlemen had made some sacrifice to the cause of education by refraining from the general discussion on going into Committee. It was perfectly true that when the Bill was read a second time some of the Scotch Members agreed to allow it to pass without discussion, upon the understanding that there was to be a discussion upon the general principle when the House went into Committee. But, at the same time, hon. Gentlemen cannot fail to see the difficulties with which the Government had had to contend. There had been meetings of the Scotch Members—the general scope of the Bill, as well as the general views of Members, were generally understood—and there had been numerous Amendments placed on the Paper. If they were to pass the Bill at all it would not do to discuss its general principle on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair, and again in Committee upon the clauses. He would confine himself to one or two observations upon the present state of the Bill, and then he trusted that they would address themselves really to the work before them. Some criticisms had been made by the noble Lord (Lord Garlies), and he (the Lord Advocate) had been asked to give some explanation upon a matter so simple and clear that he did not understand how a question had come to be raised upon it in this House. When the House read this Bill the second time, he informed the House, at the conclusion of his observations, that the Bill had been considerably altered in "another place" from the shape in which it originally stood; and as the country was not aware of the propositions of the Government upon which this House was to decide, he should follow the course of committing the Bill *pro formâ*, and re-printing it with the Amendments embodied in it. He stated it quite distinctly, and it could not have been misunderstood. They were now told that there was something disrespectful to the other House in the course that they had taken, and that they were not dealing as they ought to do with their Amendments. Hon. Gentlemen who took that view could not be aware that it was the constant practice in "another place" so to deal with Bills that come up from this House. Hon. Gentlemen were quite mistaken, both upon the constitutional theory and the practice of Parliament. The constitutional theory was that this House does not know whether a Bill has been in the House of Lords or not. Although it has passed the Lords, and although it was first introduced there, it appears before this House precisely as if it had been brought in here first. When we deal with it, we deal with it and consider it as if it had been introduced first into this House. Nothing could be further from his desire than to show the slightest discourtesy to the Amendments which had been made in "another place;" but it was indispensable that the country and the House should know clearly the propositions which the Government were prepared to make. They could not possibly accede to the Bill as it came down from the Lords, and therefore he believed he had consulted the convenience as well as the propriety in our proceedings in re-printing the Bill *pro formâ*. Now, in regard to the Amendments, it was stated that he had not informed the House what the views of the Government were upon the matters in question. He had only to say that the proposition of the Government was embodied in the Bill as it stood now with the few Amendments he had placed upon the Paper last night. The only material Amendment among them was as regards the constitution of the Board. The Lords had altered the original proposition to a Board of three paid members, and he (the Lord Advocate) made a different proposal on the second reading. He then brought the matter before the Scotch Members, and it appeared to be their opinion that a Board properly paid was the best Board. The Government were of of opinion that if that was the feeling of the Scotch Members, it ought to be given effect to; and, therefore, hon. Members will find from the Paper that that course had been adopted. He trusted the House would now go into Committee.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, that in the case of all the Bills cited by the right hon. Gentleman there was a perfect concurrence of opinion between the two Houses on the principles of the Bill. He thought that the Bill ought to have been re-printed in the shape in which it had come down from the House of Lords. Under the course pursued this House had no means of knowing what were the Amendments made by the Lords in the Bill. He had no doubt that it was perfectly in Order to take the course followed by the learned Lord in cases where there was no difference of opinion; but he thought that the impression created by his learned Friend's conduct in this case would exercise a considerable influence upon the reception of the Bill when it went back to the House of Lords.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Interpretation clause).

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER moved, as an Amendment with reference to the qualification of heritors, to leave out the qualification given in the clause, and to substitute the words, "the said heritors shall mean all owners of lands and heritages of the yearly value of £20 and upwards." In proposing that alteration he had only adopted the qualification of the Poor Law Act of 1845. The qualification named in the Bill was as old as the year 1803. The Act 43 *Geo*. III., c. 64, provided that it should not be lawful for any heritor who had not a property of at least £100 Scots to attend or vote at any meeting held in pursuance of that Act. He could not conceive why this old qualification should be retained in the present Bill. They did not want that these £100 Scots heritors only should provide schools for the people of Scotland—they wanted the people of Scotland to feel and know that they paid for the schools, which they would do under the present Bill, but that they would have the advantage of managing the schools for themselves. But the Bill, as it came down from the Lords, while it retained the old management extended the area of rating. He thought the course of the Government rather strange. It was manifest that these two clauses, as they came down from the Lords, were absurd. They might have opened the management and widened the assessment, or they might have had the close management and at the same time kept the old assessment. Her Majesty's Government had adopted the latter of the two courses. They took out the clause stating that the assessment for the schools should be levied upon the valuation-roll of Scotland, and they kept in the clause providing that the management of the schools should be left in the hands of the heritors. He earnestly trusted that the Government would give way upon this point, and would make the management of the parochial schools such as the great body of the people of Scotland desired it should be.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 40, to leave out from the words "The heritors," to the words "fifty-four," in line 42, inclusive, in order to insert the words "Heritors shall mean all owners of lands and heritages of the yearly value of twenty pounds and upwards,"—(*Sir Robert Anstruther*,)

—instead thereof.

MR. ORR EWING said, he also had an Amendment on this clause, its object being to extend and liberalize the present system by making £20 of the old Scots valuation, instead of £100, the qualification for heritor. He agreed with the hon. Baronet that they could not retain the old system of managing the schools, and at the same time extend the area of taxation for the support of the schools. The hon. Baronet wished to keep the old system of supporting the parochial schools and at the same time to liberalize the heritors. He would take the entire control out of the old heritors. The heritors of Scotland were the landed proprietors, and they had, under the Act of 1803, been burdened with the maintenance of the parochial schools; and if the Committee agreed to the proposal of the hon. Baronet, it would leave the heritors under the obligation of maintaining the schools, but take the management out of their hands. That was not fair. It was admitted by all—even by the hon. Member for Edinburgh—that the parochial schools were better managed than any schools in Scotland. Why was that? It was because they were efficiently superintended by the parochial clergy and by the heritors. He proposed to liberalize the management by describing the qualification of heritors as—

"Proprietors of lands within any parish to the extent of at least £20 Scots of valued rent appearing in the land tax books of the county within which such parish is situated."

MR. MILLER said, he had also placed an Amendment on the Paper, the object of which was, so far, to obtain the result which his hon. Friend the Member for Fifeshire sought—namely, to open up the management of the parochial schools. He desired to liberalize the heritors under the old Act, and so extend it that every man whose name was found on the land tax books should be an heritor in the sense of this Act, and should therefore have a voice in conducting the schools. He would, however, liberalize that management by bringing it back to the system in use previous to the Act of George III. He should therefore vote for the striking out of the words now in the clause, also against the words proposed by the hon. Member.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, the reason why this provision still stood in the clause before the Committee was that the Committee in their Report, after stating the objections which had been made to the management of the parochial schools, and the suggestions made for the alteration of the qualification of heritors, said—

> "There is much weight in these suggestions; but, notwithstanding some diversity of opinion, we are not prepared to recommend those alterations. Many of our number think that the parochial schools ought to possess more of national character, and that such changes should be adopted; but, after considerable inquiry, and after the investigation conducted by the Assistant Commissioners, we have resolved not to recommend that any alteration should be made on the existing management of the parochial schools."

The Bill, as it was introduced into the House of Lords, was precisely in the terms of the recommendation of the Commissioners. He (the Lord Advocate) was not prepared to say that it would be wise to assent to the parochial schools existing in their present form as a permanent state; but the principle of the Bill was to adopt these schools on their present footing — to leave under their present management both denominational and parochial schools—at the same time providing machinery for adopting them gradually into the national system. This was the compromise which was entered into, and he should feel bound to adhere to that compromise. That compromise, however, was not adhered to in "another place;" because, while the Lords adopted that course with regard to the parish schools, they deliberalized the new schools—which was part of the compromise. At the same time they also did this—for which no principle can be imagined — after leaving the management under the restricted body of heritors, under the Act of 1803, they actually widened the area of taxation, and attempted to lay the burden of supporting the parish schools on the proprietors on the new valuation-roll. After considering the matter, Her Majesty's Government came to the conclusion that, as they were anxious not to create agitation, but to pass the Bill; and as the Commissioners recommended what they had originally proposed — that they should go back to the compromise. He owned that he did so with regret. The compromise recommended by the Commissioners was, he thought, such as they would be able to pass; and therefore he must vote against the Motion of his hon. Friend.

MAJOR WALKER said, that the Assistant Commissioners stated in their Report that the elective body, as at present constituted, was good, especially where the heritors were resident—but they desired that if the system of rating was adopted the rate-payers should have some voice in the management; and this seemed to him but just. At the same time, the Commissioners add an important qualification: they said that it was of vital importance to education that this representation should be continued, as far as possible, to be confined to the educated and influential among the body of the rate-payers. He thought the clauses as they stood provided a very ample representation of the body of the rate-payers — two-thirds being elected by them, and one-third being left in the hands of the heritors—which was by no means an excessive or unnecessary provision.

MR. M'LAREN said, the question was who the heritors should be to whom they were to intrust the management of the parish schools, so long as they were not converted into ordinary national schools. There were four Amendments on the Paper, and two of them were identical with the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Miller), which was that they should return to the old principle that taxation and representation go together. But in 1803 an Act was passed depriving all the heritors, except a few large ones, of the right to vote and speak in the management of the parish schools. The object of all the four Amendments was substantially to restore the ancient law of Scotland; but he preferred that proposed by his hon. Colleague, and he hoped that the hon. Member for Fifeshire would withdraw his Amendment, and allow the sense of the House to be taken on that of his hon. Friend.

MR. LOCH said, there was no question more important with respect to the management of the parish schools, now that the constitution of the heritors was to be changed from that which was established by the Act of 1803, than to carry it back to the old law of Scotland as it existed previous to that time—namely, that all who were liable to contribute to the payment of the schoolmasters and the maintenance of the schools should have a voice in choosing the masters. He thought that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Edinburgh arrived at that object better than the one of which he had himself given notice, and therefore he should withdraw his Amendment in favour of his.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he had not the least objection to the words proposed by the hon. Member for Edinburgh—in fact, it might very possibly be that they were better words than his own. Their first object was to throw out the Government words, and assist to liberalize the meaning of the word heritors. What words they would substitute he would not say; but he was willing to take the words of the hon. Member.

MR. CRAUFURD desired to point out to the Lord Advocate that the Government proposal was refused by both sides of the House. The placing the management in the hands of the ratepayers was the only scrap of liberalism sent down in the measure from the House of Lords, and that it was now proposed to strike out by reverting to the system of 1803.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, he was equally opposed to all three Amendments. He would remind the Committee that when some years since the right hon. Gentleman introduced his Education Bill a memorial was very largely signed stating that whatever else might be done with regard to education in that country, the signataries hoped that no change would be made in the management or in the definition of the word heritor. He was satisfied that if this alteration was made it would destroy the whole framework of the Bill.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE hoped that Her Majesty's Government would take into serious consideration the strong appeal that had been made. The matter involved a question of great importance, not merely affecting the future management of these schools, but affecting the action of the Bill itself in the transfer of these parochial schools to the new management.

MR. ANDERSON thought that as the Government would never consent to bribe the heritors by making them a present of their payments as heritors, the process of absorption would not likely be so rapid as some supposed. For that reason he thought it absolutely necessary that they should consider the question of liberalizing the heritors; and as he thought the Amendment of the hon. Member for Edinburgh the most liberal, he should vote for it.

LORD ELCHO said, the hon. Member for Edinburgh had spoken slightly of the Report of the Assistant Commissioners; but the Committee must recollect that this Bill was founded on the Report of the Commission, and the opinions of the hon. Member for Edinburgh applied equally therefore to the legislation and to the Report on which it was based. The parochial schools of Scotland were a source of pride to them, and he hoped the Committee would not readily overturn a system which had worked well for many years. As a middle course between absorption and alteration, he should support the learned Lord Advocate.

COLONEL SYKES hoped that, in the face of the general expression of opinion on the part of Scotch Members, the learned Lord Advocate would not think it necessary to proceed to a division.

MR. CRUM-EWING said, it seemed to him that the only reason the Lord Advocate had had in making this alteration was that the Bill might be made agreeable, and might pass more readily in "another place." The Committee could not be actuated by any such a feeling. The people of Scotland would not be satisfied unless the schools were placed under a more liberal management than at present.

LORD HENRY SCOTT said, he should support Her Majesty's Government. The proposal of the hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Anstruther) aimed at an entirely new principle, and if it were carried the Bill would no longer be the Bill recommended by the Commissioners, or as brought in by the Lord Advocate, but a Bill based upon the principle of national, undenominational, rate-paying, compulsory education, and that was a question which, however it might be proper to discuss it at another time, was not now before the House. The Lord Advocate, in proposing what he had done, had done the best he could under the circumstances. He was willing to maintain the heritors as defined in this clause, and to give them a representation of one-third in each parish, and that he thought a very fair proposal.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Lord Advocate said he had assented to the course he now proposed merely as a matter of compromise, and against his own convictions; and the Commissioners said that they made the recommendation because the Sub-Commissioners reported them; and the Sub-Commissioners said that the large heritors in the parish and minister were so superior in observation, in freedom from local prejudice, that they were better able to choose a schoolmaster than the other inhabitants of the parish. Now he thought that conveyed an undeserved censure upon a very large class, and he should therefore support the Amendment.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he thought that if they could purchase the accession of both Houses of Parliament to the permanent management, they did not pay a very large price for it in adhering to the compromise that had been come to.

Question put, "That the words 'The heritors' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 110; Noes 65: Majority 45.

The LORD ADVOCATE *moved* to add at the end of the clause the words—

"Except in the Shetland Islands, where it shall mean proprietors of lands and heritages within the parish valued in the valuation-roll at £50 and upwards."

The exception was due to the rather important circumstance that there were no heritors in Shetland of the value of £100 Scots.

Mr. MILLER: I shall move, as an Amendment to this Amendment, that every owner upon the valuation-roll shall be entitled to vote, instead of drawing the line at £50.

After short debate, Amendment *withdrawn*, on the understanding that it should be brought up again on the Report.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Clause 2 (Board of Education in Scotland).

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he had already explained to the Scotch Members of this House the reasons which induced the Government to propose this constitution of the Board, instead of that contained in the previous Bill. No doubt this was a difficult matter; and he thought it quite true that the views which had been expressed, that this was rather a matter of administration than of principle, were correct. But he thought on the whole, that the management now proposed would be reasonable and just. It was proposed to have paid members of the Board, one of whom was to be Chairman; and there would be also Law Officers for the purposes of the Act, and a Secretary. He proposed to insert in the clause words to the effect that these persons should hold office for three years, with power to the Queen in Council to extend the time to five years; the salaries to be £1,000 for the Chairman, and £750 each for the other two paid members of the Board.

Amendment *moved*,

In page 3, line 6, after "of," leave out to "expense" in line 16, and insert "The Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland for the time being, and three other persons to be named by Her Majesty, one of whom shall be named as chairman; and it shall be enough for the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to pay to such chairman a salary not exceeding £1,000 per annum, and to each of the other two persons so to be named a salary not exceeding £750 per annum."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, this was the most important part of the Bill, because most extraordinary powers were proposed to be given to the Central Board—powers which had never been enjoyed by any other body in Scotland before—and which were entirely novel. The Board, in the first place, was to have power to put down a school wherever it might consider a school to be wanted; and it was also to have the power to tax the people where a school was put down, and to say what amount of money should be paid by them for any specific school. That was a power never yet given to any body in Scotland up to the present day, and it behoved the Committee to watch very carefully that this Central Board was such that the people of Scotland at large could repose confidence in it. He had been accused of objecting to the government of Scotland by Boards. He objected, no doubt, because they were constituted not by that House, because they were not represented in that House, and because the public of Scotland had no means of learning their proceedings. And now they were about to create another which was to be wholly irresponsible to that House. He knew that his learned Friend the Lord Advocate represented in the House not only the Boards but the whole administration of affairs in Scotland—and he knew that those affairs did not suffer in his hands. But he must take the liberty of objecting that the whole administration of affairs in Scotland should be left in the hands of the legal profession. That had been the case ever since 1742, when the last Secretary of State for Scotland (the Marquess of Tweeddale) resigned his office, which had never since been filled up. He thought the time had now come when the administration of Scotch affairs should be exercised by its laymen. What he complained of mainly in regard to this Board was that it was not represented in any degree by a lay officer in that House. They had heard a great deal of the Privy Council, and his learned Friend had told them more than once that he was in mortal terror of the Privy Council, and those who administered the grants. Now, the Vice President, who sat beside him, was the most amiable of men. He had conducted a long and important Bill through that House in such a manner as to win the respect and regard of hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House. Why, therefore, the Lord Advocate should be afraid of the Vice President of the Committee of Education and the Chancellor of the Exchequer he could not conceive. The Committee of the Privy Council was a very formidable body; but there could be no doubt that the *vis inertia* of that body was very great. The complaint was that it did not apprehend the genius of Scotch education. That complaint was almost universal throughout Scotland; and when his learned Friend admitted that it would be an advantage to the Privy Council to have upon it a Scotch Member who could represent what were really their wishes upon all matters connected with education, he believed he only re-echoed the prevailing opinion throughout the whole of Scotland.

MR. ORR EWING said, he quite agreed with the hon. Baronet as to the great importance of the question now under consideration; but he did not exactly agree with him in the conclusions which he wished that the House should come to. The hon. Baronet seemed to consider it of great importance that this Central Board should have a representation in that House. His (Mr. Ewing's) opinion was that it was a matter of far greater consequence that the Board should represent the people of Scotland, and for that reason he had ventured to place on the Paper the Amendment which stood in his name. He had no confidence in a nominated Central Board. He had, on the contrary, every confidence in an elected Board. He had, too, the greatest confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers, on whatever side of the House they might sit, if left to their own free will, to elect men to fill the position of Commissioners; but they all knew the influence brought to bear upon them whenever a vacancy arose, so that they came to a decision, not in accordance with their own opinions, but rather under the political influence which was brought to bear upon them. He wished to have this Board elective, as the only means of procuring a Scotch Board. He wanted it to be not only thoroughly Scotch, but to have upon it a representative of those hardworking and most useful body of men, the schoolmasters, who had been too much ignored by this Bill. He did not know of any better means of giving them a proper position in the country than to give them a representative on the Board which would in future have the management of education in Scotland. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment of which he had given notice.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that as the hon. Baronet the Member for Fifeshire (Sir Robert Anstruther) had made some allusion to the Department with which he was connected, he wished to state what, as it seemed to him, was the relation of the Privy Council to the matters contemplated in this Bill. He did not understand that the Bill intended that the Board should in any way act under the Privy Council. The object of the Privy Council was that it should be responsible to the House and the country for the administration of what might be considered State aid out of Imperial money for educational purposes both in England and Scotland. He took it that the most important object of this Board—an object the importance of which could not be overrated — was to ascertain where there should be rated schools. That was the business of the Board. The business of the Privy Council was simply to superintend the administration of State aid. The Board was in no way put under the Privy Council. It was said there is no power of appeal. That was not correct. An appeal was provided for by Clause 31 of the Bill; and he wished hon. Members to observe that it was an appeal not to the Privy Council, but to the Secretary of State. He thought, also, there might be a little misconception arising in the minds of hon. Members from the words—"Committee of Council of Education." Those were old-fashioned words, which had about the same meaning, or very little more, than the words Poor Law Board. Both in the Educational Department as well as in the Poor Law Board, the business was really worked as in the other Departments of the public service—namely, by officers, one in each House, who were responsible for their Department; but he rose to state that there was no intention on the part of the Government to give the Committee of Council on Education any power over that important part of the Bill which was to decide where in Scotland rate schools should be established, and how the inhabitants of Scotland should be taxed to pay that rate. He thought he ought not to sit down without stating—as there seemed to be a not unnatural jealousy of the Privy Council in the distribution of State aid in Scotland — that they were perfectly aware of the different circumstances of Scotland from England, and that they had no wish to thrust the Revised Code down the throats of Scotchmen. Taking, generally, England and Scotland, and comparing them together, Scotland was in advance of England. He should greatly regret to see anything done, either by the Privy Council or by any other action of the Government, which would injure the present system in Scotland. He rejoiced that in Scotland all classes were brought together in the schools, and that the higher education was attained by all classes and denominations. He thought, therefore, that the Scotch Members might rely that it was not the intention of the Government to break down this system, or to extend payment by results —which had worked well in England, and which, it was considered, would also work well in Scotland—in such a way as to injure the present system in Scotland.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he was convinced that the only way in which they could secure that responsibility to Parliament which all desired was that the inquiries and the decision as to what new schools were required for Scotland should rest with a Department of the Government; and for his part he did not know any body upon whom it would be better to confer this duty than the Committee of the Privy Council, if connected with it there should be some department more especially having control in respect of the places in which new schools should be planted. He thought, too, that in the administration of this part of the Bill a Committee like that of the Privy Council would enjoy great advantages. He did not wish to underrate the importance of local responsibility; but he thought a body independent of local prejudices would act with greater responsibility, and a more just effect with regard to the wants of Scotland, than even a Board sitting in Edinburgh. In carrying out this measure far more depended, in his opinion, upon who were to be the Inspectors and who should furnish the reports than upon the Board. The Board would act judicially, and their duties could be equally as well exercised by a body connected with the Privy Council. He owned there was a strong feeling against the Privy Council in reference to Scotch grants. He did not share in that feeling, and thought it was founded, to a great extent, upon misconception, and would disappear when it was found that the inspection was efficient and undenominational. Further, he wished to say he did not share in the jealousy felt towards the Privy Council in regard to the Revised Code. He knew there was a strong feeling on the subject, especially amongst the schoolmasters; but he thought that feeling was unjustly entertained, and he could, if necessary, adduce proofs that the Revised Code was as much wanted in Scotland as in England. He, for one, was inclined to place confidence in the administration of the Privy Council.

MR. BRUCE said, the question was not as to whether the Revised Code should be introduced into Scotland or not, but what should be the body to say what means of education were still wanting to Scotland? The Inspectors were not persons who were possessed of the requisite information. Their business was to examine schools—that they could do perfectly — but their business had never been to state what were the educational wants of a district. They had no means of instituting inquiries; and if the Privy Council had to conduct these inquiries, it would be necessary to appoint special officers for that purpose.

MR. M'LAREN said, that, as this was the fourth form of the Board which had been submitted to the House, Her Majesty's Government could not complain that a short time was spent in inquiring whether it was the best possible Board which could be chosen. It was admitted that upon that Board would depend the working of the measure. In the case of the Board of Trade, the Poor Law Board, &c., these were constitutional Boards, although the subordinate members were not seen, or heard of. The President of each of these Boards did what he conceived to be his duty to the public, and when any complaint was made he was answerable for it in Parliament; and that was a system which has recommended itself to the good opinion of all enlightened men in this country. But the Board proposed to be constituted by this Bill was not to have these advantages, and yet was to have far greater power in some respects than any of the Boards to which he had referred. Why, the Board was substantially to enact that hundreds of schools were to be erected in Scotland by means of local taxation; for the Commissioners said that there were 90,000 children in Scotland who were not at school. The money needed for existing schools other than parochial was also to be raised by local taxation, so that, substantially, this new Board was to be a Board for taxing the people of Scotland to a very large extent. What was required to be done could not certainly be done for less than £1,000,000, and this Board would have practically the power of laying on rates to that extent. Now it had never been known in the history of any portion of the United Kingdom—in England, in Ireland, or Scotland —that any Board was ever appointed for laying on taxes. There were Boards to point out what should be done; but their powers were never so large as those which were given by this Bill. If they could, by the Bill, get an executive Board that would be responsible in the House, through its President, like the Board of Trade, such an executive Board would be by far the best. Now, the Members and Secretary were to have salaries amounting to £2,500 a year; but if they were to save £500 of this and give £2,000 to a Gentleman who should be responsible in this House for the action of the Board, to hear complaints, and to give explanations, and acting along with an unpaid Board in Edinburgh or anywhere else, they would have an admirably working organization. It had been said that it had been agreed at a meeting of the Scotch Members, that the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General were to be members of the Board *ex officio*. He (Mr. M'Laren) then, and now, objected altogether to those high officials being placed on the Board. As a security, it was altogether illusory. In the case of the Lord Advocate, he was practically Home Secretary for Scotland, and he believed there was not one Scotch Member who did not believe that the duties he had already to perform were far more than any man living could get through satisfactorily. And, in point of fact, his original duties, as public prosecutor for Scotland, had, for a long series of years, been little more than nominal. The presence of the Lord Advocate on these occasions, on criminal trials, had been becoming more and more rare. The Solicitor General used to be always present in the absence of the Lord Advocate; but of late, he believed, the attendance of either was very rare, and was only given on very important occasions. As Her Majesty's Government seemed not to have quite made up their minds on some of these points, he would suggest to them to consider whether their propositions, as embodied in this Bill, were not susceptible of great improvement.

DR. LYON PLAYFAIR said, a Scotch Board had been introduced into the Bill in order to satisfy the public feeling in Scotland, and in no place had the idea Scotch or Scotch Board been objected to.

In fact, it was in consequence of public opinion that the Government were forced to bring forward a Scotch Board at all. Now, the discussion which had taken place had gone in a course rather foreign to the Bill, which provided that there should be, in consonance with public feeling in Scotland, a Scotch Board. But this last form of it was made in deference to the strongly-expressed opinion of the Scotch Members themselves, in the private meeting upstairs, and when the Lord Advocate suggested those modifications which they were now considering, there was no objection on the part of Scotch Members at all. The Board was not so expensive as it appeared to be. A representative Board implied a large number of special Commissioners to do the work all over the country. But this Board was a Board of Commissioners whose whole time would be given to the work, and who would be themselves the special Commissioners who would go to the different parts of the country and settle where the schools should be placed. He believed this Board would be a positive economy instead of an expense to the Government.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, he wished to make a suggestion for the amendment of this clause. As to the presence of the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General upon the Board, all he could say was that so far as the Solicitor General was concerned, he knew he was out of pocket by his office of Solicitor General, and it would be hard to entail upon him still further duties to which he could not attend; his time was too valuable. With regard to the Lord Advocate, his duties were so enormous that it was ridiculous to expect him to be able to attend. But he did think they ought to have a lay representative on the Board. His right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council had no intention to force on Scotland the English Privy Council. But the whole of the jurisdiction with reference to the issue of codes and regulations seemed to be confined to the Council, without any reference to the Scotch Boards. Now, the fact was, they ought to have a Scotch department in the Privy Council; and therefore he begged to move the insertion of the following words—"a Secretary of Council for Scotland."

The LORD ADVOCATE said, it was easy to frame an abstract scheme of education—the question was, can you enforce it? We have adopted the old Scottish system—a system of rates, and a system of rates which shall be compulsory; and, of course, the problem was how to make the system of rates compulsory without being arbitrary and oppressive. In the first instance he must own he was in favour of adopting the machinery of the Privy Council. But, in the first place, the Privy Council could by no possibility do the work which it was required to do; and, secondly, public feeling in Scotland was so strong on this point that it would be impossible to propose such a system. What kind of management then were they to have? He was not going to go into the question of a Secretary of State for Scotland. It had been before the House many times, and the result had hitherto been the same. As to the administration by a Board sitting in Scotland, much exaggerated language had been used with regard to existing Boards. Now he believed that the Scotch Boards were the cheapest administrative departments in the three kingdoms, and they were at the same time the most efficient. A Board of this kind must do its own work, and the work which the Board in this instance was to do was work which could not be done on this side of the Border—and the only result of attempting it would be that there would be two departments—a nominal department in London, and a real department in Scotland. They could not have in London a Board for the control of schoolmasters in Scotland. But it was said there ought to be a person in this House responsible. He was not going to express any strong opinion on the matter. Upon the hon. Member for Edinburgh's (Mr. M'Laren's) showing, it was impossible for any person to be really responsible for such work. The hon. Member said the Lord Advocate ought not to be a member of the Board, because he cannot attend. But he wanted another a member of the Board who cannot attend either, because he must be in Parliament. To make the Lord Advocate responsible for the work of the Board is a great mockery; but he might be responsible for work which he could not do. Beyond this they could not unite the two things. They could not have a reasonable responsibility for the Board and attendance at Parliament at the same time. He had a strong impression that, while the Board must be responsible to Parliament, it was not desirable that the administration of the Board should change with every new Administration. The discussion of the Education Votes by the Privy Council was essential. Perhaps in some future time something like a Scottish Financial Department might come to exist, together with a Scotch Member of the Privy Council having Scotch matters in hand; but at present they could not tell what was required. He trusted the House would accept the Board. It was not perfect, but he thought it was as near it as possible, and that it would prove to be so.

MR. CRUM-EWING considered the constitution of the Board, as proposed by the Lord Advocate, exceedingly objectionable. If the Lord Advocate was a member of any Board, he was at the head of it, and he (Mr. Crum-Ewing) objected to this. For his part, he would like to see a person in the House who would answer all questions put to him.

MR. KINNAIRD said, his hon. Friend did not apprehend what the Lord Advocate had said. There were to be three Commissioners. Then, the Lord Advocate and Solicitor General were the legal assessors; and it was much better to have officers of that ability and legal knowledge. They would be able to attend to their duties here.

COLONEL SYKES said, he had always been against Boards. If they wanted executive efficiency, it must rest with one man. They would then have individual responsibility. With a Board, if anything went wrong, it would always be—"Oh! it's the Board." Besides, they were now engaged in a new source of expenditure to the country. Here were three gentlemen appointed at a cost of £2,500, with secretaries and clerks. Then came the rent of houses, as they would see in the Estimates next year. The Scotch Board would be responsible to the Privy Council, from which an appeal was given to the Secretary of State, which meant the man at the head of the Council of Education. [MR. W. E. FORSTER: No, no; the Home Secretary.] Well, then, an individual in London. He objected, therefore, to this Board—first, because of its expensiveness; and secondly, because of its inefficiency, there being no individual responsibility.

MR. CRAUFURD said, the suggestion was, that there should be a Board of three, to be appointed for three years, to which he (Mr. Craufurd) wished to add that the Lord Advocate should be put upon the Board, and then that there should be a layman on the Board, and securing a Scotch element in the Privy Council. That was what he proposed, which would carry out what was done in Ireland. The Chief Secretary for Ireland was an *ex-officio* member of the Board, and had a seat at the Privy Council. They ought to have some Scotch element on the Privy Council.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that the proposition which was now brought forward was substantially one which met with considerable approval from a large number of Scotch Members. ["No, no!"] His hon. Friend (Mr. Craufurd) seemed to wish that there should be a representative of the Board in the Privy Council. Now, he would show him what that meant. It meant confusion between two matters which it was very desirable to keep separate—that was the administration of State grants of Imperial funds and the administration of Scotch funds out of the rates, and he could not help thinking that it would be to the advantage of Scotland that these two matters should be kept distinct. The object of the Board was to see where schools should be built, and where the inhabitants should be compelled to pay rates for their maintenance. That seemed a matter which ought to be managed by Scotchmen in Scotland. He did not think the State money ought to be managed by Englishmen or Scotchmen. There was nothing to prevent anybody —Scotchman or Englishman—from filling the Office he (Mr. Forster) had the honour to hold. The money controlled by the holder of that Office for the time being should be administered without regard to any particular country, and nothing would tend more to confusion and to bad administration than to make two persons responsible to this House for the administration of State money. Whoever had to move the Estimates, and to ask for State money, ought to be the one man responsible to the House, and, therefore, he could not conceive there would be any advantage in putting a fresh Member of the Privy Council into this House and on the Board to attend to part of this very thing.

MR. ORR EWING said, as his Amendment had not met with support from either side of the House, he begged to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment to insert after "the Lord Advocate" the words "a Secretary of Council for Scotland," put, and *negatived.*

MR. MILLER then proposed to leave out the words "the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland."

MR. BRUCE said, his learned Friend the Lord Advocate had undertaken to consider the suggestion whether power should not be taken at some future time to appoint one or more other persons in addition to the three paid Commissioners. Until that question had been fully considered, he thought it would be inexpedient to withdraw the names of the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland.

After short conversation, Amendment (*Mr. Miller*), by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment (*The Lord Advocate*) *agreed to.*

On Question "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,"

LORD ELCHO said, it was admitted that this clause was the most important one of the Bill. Now, it was very important they should know at what hour of the night the Report would be brought up; because it was manifest that if it was brought up at two or three o'clock in the morning, the Government could do anything they liked in regard to it. If this clause was now passed on the understanding that matters of importance in it were to be considered on the Report, then there ought to be the further understanding that the Report would be taken at an early hour in the evening when the Government might not be able to do exactly what they pleased.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he did not think it was too much to announce that before the Bill left the Committee the Government would be able to say what course they would pursue on the subject.

MR. SINCLAIR AYTOUN asked if they could not have a decisive declaration as to when the further progress of the Bill would be taken?

Mr. W. E. Forster

MR. BRUCE said, the utmost it was possible to do, under present circumstances, was to put it down for Thursday, and on that day to announce the earliest possible sitting on which it could be taken.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he thought the announcement of the right hon. Gentleman yesterday, as to Supply, was not quite understood. Eight days, after Supply was closed, must elapse before the prorogation could possibly take place. Now, this was a Lords' Bill; and supposing that it was the most important measure left for our consideration, and supposing also that Supply was to be finished before they again went into Committee on it, there would afterwards still remain five or six days in which it should be discussed. It being the end of the Session, the Lords would probably not take long to consider our Amendments, but would dispose of them quickly. It did not therefore seem to be unreasonable that the further proceeding with the Bill should be postponed until Supply was closed; and he presumed that Scotch Members were anxious to get to the North as soon as they could.

MR. ELLICE protested entirely against the doctrine of the right hon. Gentleman. He did not think that Government was entitled to any consideration at their hands. This was the single Scotch Bill of the Session—and they had been put off to the very end of the Session. Other hon. Gentlemen, who lived within easy reach of London, could get away in the course of the Session and come back again. They could get away now. They (the Scotch Members) could not do so. They were entirely cut off from those interests that naturally drew them in Scotland, in order to wait on this Bill, and he said that they (the Scotch Members) —and also the hon. Gentlemen from Ireland—were entitled to the first consideration. They had the right to expect that the Government should now tell them when they meant to go on with the Bill. Why not give them a Morning Sitting on Friday? He thought the Government might have treated them more liberally at an earlier period; but, now, after they had been sitting there quietly supporting the Government through thick and thin the whole of the Session, they were to be put off to the very end of the Session.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he wholly agreed in what had been said by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not understand how things were arranged; but he believed that the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Ayrton) had something to do with the arrangement of the Public Business—and of course metropolitan matters seemed to him more important than those connected with Scotland. He thought it was the duty of the Government to let them know when the next stage of the Bill was to be taken.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Secretary).

MR. C. DALRYMPLE wished to ask the Question in regard to the Secretary to the Board, upon which he had already endeavoured to obtain some information. He had spoken to at least half the Scotch Members upon it, and he had found extraordinary agreement among them upon it. Every Member to whom he had spoken was clearly of the opinion that the Secretary of the new Board ought to be a layman. He ought to say that one or two Members, whose position entitled them to great respect, hesitated to say that a minister of religion should never be Secretary; but that at the outset the Secretary ought certainly to be a layman. He did not now ask Her Majesty's Government to pledge themselves to name the Secretary in the Bill; he did not ask them to say that a minister of religion should never be Secretary; but he thought that they might fairly ask them to state that at the outset, at all events, he should be a layman. He had heard it said out-of-doors that the exclusion of ministers of religion from the secretaryship implied a slur on them, whereas their exclusion ought only to be insisted on — at least at the outset of new legislation — in the interests of fairness, and in order to prevent the infusion of any sectarian element.

Clause *agreed to.*

LORD ELCHO said, it seemed to him that the clause ought not to have been passed without an answer being given to the question of his hon. Friend.

MR. BRUCE said, he had no idea that it had passed, for, there being other business of great importance, he fully intended that Progress should be reported after the second clause. He begged to renew the assurance that had been already given, that the Government would take into its most careful consideration any expression of opinion, either on that side of the House or on this, as to the Secretary; but he did not consider that, before they had made up their minds whom they should appoint, it was right to decide this point one way or the other. It was his most earnest desire that the Bill should be passed at the earliest possible moment; but nothing could be gained by fixing its next stage until Thursday. But he repeated that the earliest day that could be would be given.

LORD ELCHO: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give no information as to the Secretary on the Report?

MR. BRUCE said, he fully expected to be able to do so.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at ten minutes after Nine o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 28th July, 1869.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading* — Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment [244].

Second Reading—Capital Punishment Abolition [71], *put off;* Game Laws (Scotland) [36], *debate adjourned;* Seamen's Clothing * [242].

Committee—East India Loan * [251]—R.P.; Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [221]—R.P.

Committee — Report — Seeds Adulteration (*re-comm.*) * [222]; Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham) (*re-comm.*) * [210].

Third Reading—Fisheries (Ireland) * [190], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2) * [47]; Sunday Trading * [5]; Parochial Schoolmasters (Scotland) * [72]; Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption * [81]; Admiralty District Registries * [229].

IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME.

QUESTION.

Sir FREDERICK W. HEYGATE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he will state to the House what steps the Irish Government are taking to suppress the recent outbreak of agrarian crime in certain districts of Ireland; and, whether they have any course in contemplation to increase the efficiency of the law and to give that protection to life and property which it is the object of all Governments to afford?

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: Sir, the Question of my hon. Friend relates to a subject which I need not say demands and engages the constant watchfulness and anxiety of the Irish Government. My hon. Friend's Question in part refers to new and exceptional legislation upon this subject. Now, Sir, the Government do not shrink, and will not shrink, from legislation upon this subject, however exceptional, if they shall be convinced of the absolute and unhappy necessity for such legislation; and further, provided that such legislation shall, in their judgment, not merely be strong or violent in appearance, but shall be reasonably calculated and likely to attain the end in view—that is to say, the protection of life and property against this peculiar class of offence. But, Sir, we have not proposed to the House such legislation at present, because we have not been able to satisfy ourselves that legislation such as we should be justified in recommending to Parliament would seriously and effectually remove the grand difficulty of the whole matter—the detection of crime and the procuring of evidence sufficient to convict. I venture to say that much has been done in the execution of the law as it stands, and I trust that even more will be done. The vigilance and zeal of the police have been beyond all praise, and the Government have exercised constant watchfulness and care in the use of the powers which they now possess. In every case where life and property are in danger or threatened, they have endeavoured to protect it, and to send a protecting force to every such locality, the expense of such force being generally charged upon the district itself, and I am convinced that much mischief has been prevented. I am sorry to say that we have not yet obtained a conviction in any one of the cases of agrarian murder which have occurred during the last few months, although we have obtained convictions in some important cases of the same kind of lesser atrocity. But many arrests have been made, and, in several cases, suspected persons are likely to be put upon their trial. In one case especially—the recent attempt to murder Captain Lambert, in Galway—there is no doubt that an important prisoner will be placed upon his trial, and I am much mistaken if it is not then found that in that case the police acted with remarkable activity and discretion. The hon. Baronet will recognize that it is not possible to answer a Question of this kind very completely, because in such matters as the detection of crime or the putting upon their trial of men not yet called upon for their defence, any one in my position must speak with considerable reserve. I may conclude, however, by saying that the state of crime in Ireland upon the whole, as shown particularly by the recent charges of the Judges, is satisfactory; and, in spite of the most unsatisfactory condition of certain districts and of two recent attempts at murder, which have been happily unsuccessful, I still have great hope, provided always that no excessive and unjustifiable use of the rights of property be exercised—I mean such as that which produced the outrage in Tipperary last autumn — that the vigilance of the Government, and their constant efforts, which shall not be spared, to use to the utmost all the powers they possess, may keep under this lamentable class of offences.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL—[Bill 71.]

(*Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. M'Laren, Sir John Gray.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. GILPIN, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, the task had fallen to his lot by reason of the death of his lamented friend the late Member for Dumfries (Mr. W. Ewart), who was one of the leaders of the great reform he now advocated, and whose labours during many years were almost in this cause incessant. Since he had last the opportunity of addressing the House on this subject, circumstances had very much changed. At that time we had public executions; frequent scenes such as that described by Coventry Patmore—

> "Thousands of hearts beat horrid hope,
> Thousands of eyeballs lit with Hell,
> Burnt one way all to see the rope
> Unslacken as the platform fell."

When he last spoke it was in opposition to the Government Bill providing that in future the execution of criminals should be carried out in private, which measure was said by some hon. Members to be a step in the direction he was pursuing—the direction of humanity, good morals, and sound criminal jurisprudence. This system of private execution was one of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners; and let him pause to inquire for a moment what it was. They were informed that the first private execution made a policeman sick; and he had the authority of a gentleman, as able, probably, as any gentleman who had filled the office of under-sheriff in London, for saying that under no conceivable circumstances would he serve the office again, so long as there were private executions inside Newgate Prison. Public opinion was, he ventured to say, making rapid strides in the direction indicated by this Bill. It was twenty years since he held public meetings, fairly called, over the length and breadth of the land, and obtained almost unanimous votes in favour of the abolition of the death punishment; and now he found the *Globe,* a newspaper which could scarcely be suspected of sentimental philanthropy, was mainly with him, and saying that to execute the wretched woman Fanny Oliver, recently convicted of the murder of her husband, would be shocking to the moral sense and the judicial sentiment of a great number of the people of this country. The question they had first to consider in the matter was, no doubt, the best mode of preventing murder. In the course he was taking he disclaimed all sympathy with crime or with criminals further than that sympathy which every man ought to feel with fallen sinners, however degraded and however fallen. During the last discussions of this subject it was thought by many hon. Members of that House, and by a great number of people outside of it, that—

> "Those grisly teachers, the beam and rope,"

were really teachers of morals, and that men, women, and children learned at the foot of the scaffold lessons of morality and goodness; but this feeling had happily passed almost completely away. The strongest safeguard of life was its sanctity, and that sanctity every execution diminished. On the last occasion, Mr. John Stuart Mill—a gentleman whom he was sorry to miss from that House—opposed his Motion in a speech the least logical he ever heard for so logical a man; but, unfortunately, the rules of the House did not permit him (Mr. Gilpin) to attempt a reply. Mr. Mill acknowledged the good work that had been done by the abolitionists, but said they had now gone far enough and must stop; but in answer to that he said that unless civilization, the progress of humanity, and the influences of religion ceased to have power, the gallows must fall, or these influences must be exerted against it. Mr. Mill's strong point was that the gallows had a deterrent influence on the minds of the criminal classes. The hon. Member did not approve of public executions; but he thought that the knowledge by persons disposed to criminal practices that a murderer was being quietly hanged inside a gaol would have a deterrent influence, and he also expressed an opinion that imprisonment for life, without hope of release—the punishment proposed by abolitionists to be substituted for hanging in cases of murder—was a punishment such as no human being could bear; although he admitted the wisdom of retaining such a class of punishment for secondary offences. Mr. Mill denied that the responsibility of those who execute a criminal extends in any sense to that awful eternity into which nevertheless the action of the Judge and executioner thrust a criminal; and on this he joined issue, and contended that they had no right to say, after they had convicted a man of murder, that there should remain so many days only in which he should have an opportunity of making his peace with Heaven; and that if he had made his peace they should make him, as far as the act of execution could do it, an inheritor of Heaven; for the very reason that he had committed a murder. And the alternative was not less awful, for it was that the law should shut out from repentance, by shortening the time which God would have given him to repent, a criminal, who, by the very act he had committed, was the man having the greatest need of repentance and of mercy. Passing on to speak of the history of this question, the hon. Member referred to the great work done in the early part of this century by Sir Samuel Romilly, in breaking down the system under which the death penalty was inflicted for petty theft, and then proceeded to regret that his hon. Friends (Mr. Lewis and Mr. Tipping) should have thought proper to place on the Paper a proposal that the Bill be rejected. Neither of those hon. Gentlemen wished the execution of innocent people, or that women should be hanged for infanticide, and they would therefore have done better if, instead of endeavouring to procure the rejection of the Bill, they had supported a strong recommendation to the Home Secretary for the carrying out of the recommendations in which the Royal Commissioners were unanimous. He had no doubt that he should be met by the opponents of this measure with the opinions of sundry learned Judges; but he would call the attention of the House to the fact that since the time when the stealing of 5*s.* was a capital offence, all amelioration of the law had been doggedly opposed by the Judges, the Bishops, and the Archbishops of this country. He had also the opinion of Baron Deasy—a learned gentleman, who would be recollected as a Member of the House—that in many respects Judges were less able to form opinions upon questions of this kind than were by-standers who looked on at the administration of justice. When it was first proposed to repeal the Act of William, which made private theft in a shop to the value of 5*s.* a capital offence, the Bill passed the House of Commons, and was defeated in the House of Lords by 31 to 11, and he hoped he should not hurt the feelings of his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) when he said that in the majority were an Archbishop and six Bishops, whom Romilly mentions in his diary, but adds that "he preferred to believe that they were slavishly obeying the commands of the Minister rather than that they voted spontaneously from delight in the shedding of blood." In 1811, 1813, and 1816, the Bill was passed by the House of Commons, but rejected by the Lords. In 1818, it was again passed in the Commons, but in that year the hand of death arrested the work of the great philanthropist, and Romilly died. Who would not say, in the language of Mr. Phillips—

> "May that resplendent example never be forgotten! May Romilly's untiring perseverance — nvincible but by death—animate his successors in this Christian cause till the *cursed tree* is totally uprooted."

In 1840 Mr. Ewart brought forward a Motion for entire abolition, and got ninety-four Members to vote with him; and, in 1866, fifty-six voted for a similar Motion; nor had the question ever been regarded in that House as a party question. In 1846 a Committee, for promoting the question, was formed in Exeter Hall, of which Daniel O'Connell, John Bright, Charles Dickens, Douglas Jerrold, and Dr. Lushington were members, and Mr. Cobden was one of the most earnest advocates of the question. In 1864 a Royal Commission was appointed, which recommended that capital punishment should, for the future, be restricted to such murders as were committed with express malice aforethought, when the existence of this malice was found by the jury; that it should be abolished in the ordinary cases of infanticide; and that executions should in future take place within the walls of the prison. Of these recommendations, the last only had been carried out by the Government; but the law by which girls were sentenced to death—though the Judge knew perfectly well that they would no more be hanged than he would himself—was still allowed to disgrace the administration of justice. The bill of indictment he had to prefer against capital punishments was a long one; but he would substantiate every charge he brought against it. The first charge he had to make was its uncertainty of application. This was, in some sense, true of every punishment; but the punishment of death was different from that of every other. They could remit the sentence and award compensation in every other case, if a mistake was proved; but in the case of the execution of an innocent person, where was the reparation to be made to him? How could they roll back the portals of eternity, and bring back the man into the world out of which they had ignominiously thrust him? The consequence was that the evidence, which was held sufficient to prove any other crime, was not held sufficient here, and the punishment was most uncertain. In the year 1867-8 there were 255 verdicts of wilful murder by coroners' juries — ninety-four were tried at the assizes, twenty-seven were found guilty; in seventeen of these cases the punishment was commuted, and only ten were executed. He held that the deterrent influence of a punishment was in proportion to its certainty, and not to its severity. When only ten criminals were executed out of 255 cases, in which coroners' juries returned verdicts of wilful murder, it confirmed the statement he had formerly made in that House, that a murderer had a much greater chance of escaping the penalty due to his crime than the perpetrator of an offence much less serious. In 1867, twenty men and seven women were sentenced to death; ten men were executed, and all the women were spared. Some years ago a woman was convicted of having smothered two children, the children of her paramour. She and the man she lived with quarrelled, and she rushed upstairs in a fit of uncontrollable jealousy, and smothered the two children. She had no sooner done this than she became conscious of her crime; she gave herself up, acknowledging her crime, and wrote some most touching letters to the man during her incarceration. On the morning of her execution she went to the gallows singing hymns, and she was executed with an assurance on the part of the Ordinary of Newgate—which he had a right to give in accordance with his sacred functions—that, being truly repentant, she would be forgiven, and that the drop of the scaffold would be the opening to her of the gates of Heaven. He commended this case especially to the attention of his hon. Friend (Mr. J. D. Lewis). He asked him what he thought of this—

> "Blossoms of the gallows tree;"

and he challenged him to produce one right, moral, or Christian principle, or precept, which such an example illustrated or enforced. As a contrast to this, he might specify another case, in which a married lady murdered her two children also from jealousy; but, as she possessed ample means, an array of witnesses appeared at the trial to depose to her insanity, and she was consequently found insane, and imprisoned during the Queen's pleasure. She was now free. That showed how unequally the law pressed against the poor; for how could the friends of the poor woman at Bethnal Green find the means of proving her insanity? The objections to the present system could perhaps not be better summed up than they were in the following passage from Mr. Dymond's work, entitled *The Law on its Trial*:—

> "It is conceded by most persons that inflicting the penalty is open to many grave difficulties; that occasionally great criminals escape, because juries dread the consequence of a capital verdict; that, moreover, life has been, and may again be sacrificed through mistaken or false evidence; that a capital conviction almost inevitably awakens a feeling of pity for the culprit, rather than a healthy detestation of his crime; that, in short, public opinion continually revolts against the law, whilst it is extremely difficult to bring the administration of the law into strict harmony with public opinion."

A remarkable case was that of Samuel Wright, a working carpenter at Southwark, who lived with a woman who was not his wife, and addicted to habits of drunkenness. He was one night awakened by her dragging him out of bed by the hair, and, finding a razor lying open, he, maddened by her conduct, cut her throat with it. He believed that no jury in England would have convicted that man of wilful murder; but Wright pleaded guilty, and would not withdraw the plea, though he was pressed to do so by the Judge. He was sentenced to death, and 2,000 of his fellow-workmen signed a petition for a reprieve, and took it up in a body to the Home Office. Unfortunately this was taken by the then Home Secretary as something like a menace, and the application was refused, the man being executed with every sign of the sympathy of his neighbours, who kept their blinds down. About the same time a man named Hall committed a most deliberate murder in Birmingham. But a different pressure was brought to bear upon the Home Secretary; almost all Birmingham was moved to petition on his behalf, and the man's life was spared.

MR. BRUCE said, the hon. Gentleman ought not to conclude his statement without saying that it was the case of a husband murdering a faithless wife. In Wright's case his victim was his mistress.

MR. GILPIN: Yes; but he was not hanged for keeping a mistress, but for killing a woman; but whilst the less guilty murderers were often hanged, the more guilty were often either saved or had their punishments commuted. Charlotte Winsor, the worst murderess of modern times—the cold-blooded creature who, systematically and as a matter of business, murdered helpless infants at the rate of £5 each—was last year spared from the gallows and committed to penal servitude for life. On the other hand, women far less ferocious have been hanged; as, for instance, Mary Ashford, at Exeter, in March, 1866, and Ann Lawrence, at Maidstone, in January, 1867. In June, 1863, Alice Holt was committed for murder at Chester; but being found pregnant was imprisoned for half a year and then hanged, after all the sufferings of prolonged suspense and of childbirth. Constance Kent, in consideration of her youth, was reprieved; but, last August, a youth named Bradley, aged eighteen, was hanged at Jersey. Victor Hugo and many others interceded for him, but in vain. Yet the local notice of his life stated—

> "It appears that the said Francis Bradley has from his childhood been brought up in the midst of misery and crime, and has never received the slightest moral or religious education, but has always been without a home or a friend."

Celestina Somner took her daughter into a cellar at Islington, and there cut her throat; yet she was reprieved, and was living still. Annette Myers, who in broad daylight went and shot a soldier in Birdcage Walk, and who was proved afterwards to be the daughter of a baronet, was reprieved. Martha Brough, who murdered six children, in 1864, was reprieved on the ground of insanity, as the jury could not imagine that any person in her senses would murder six children. Townley was reprieved, and proved the propriety of the decision by afterwards committing suicide in a state of insanity.

He came next to an argument which was regarded by many as the most important of all, and that was the number of persons condemned and executed, or sentenced to execution, who were afterwards proved to be innocent. On this subject he would call his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary himself into court. He stated, only a few weeks ago, that at the last Spring Assizes two persons were sentenced to death who were entirely innocent.

Mr. Gilpin

MR. BRUCE said, the one was innocent and the other insane.

MR. GILPIN said, one was set absolutely at liberty, and the other was found not guilty on the ground of insanity. William Cummings was hanged at Edinburgh in 1853, and died protesting his innocence. Hutchings was hanged at Maidstone in 1847, and died protesting his innocence. Mary Rogers, a cold-blooded, deliberate murderess, who was convicted at Shrewsbury Assizes in 1851, had her sentence commuted. She had taken her child to a pool, drowned it, and coolly bent a stick to keep it down, so that there was no special grounds for mercy. In 1854, William Rollinson, who was convicted at Bury St. Edmunds of deliberate poisoning, had his sentence commuted by Lord Palmerston, in consideration of his extreme old age, he being eighty-three years old, while Allenmain was executed at Stirling, aged eighty-four. There was the well-known case of Polizzioni, who was found guilty of murdering a man in a public-house on Saffron Hill, and was saved from death through the exertions of Mr. Negretti, who saw him in his cell and was convinced of his innocence, another man being afterwards tried for the same crime, and found guilty of unlawful wounding, for which he received a sentence of penal servitude. In the case of Polizzioni, it was worthy of remark that the able and humane Judge who tried him was so convinced of his guilt that he held out no hope of mercy. Yet, within a few days of the morning fixed for the execution, the Judge and the Home Office were convinced of the prisoner's innocence, and he was set free. Lunatics were imprisoned for life, and he saw no reason why murderers might not be confined for life with as much security for society as if the executioner had done his work. On this subject a pamphlet, published by Mr. Charles Phillips, entitled *Vacation Thoughts on Capital Punishments*, contained some information of the highest interest, which he should beg to read to the House. Referring to the examination of Mr. Sheriff Wilde before the Commission of 1836, he quoted that gentleman's evidence, that—

> "'Many innocent persons have suffered; I think that if the documents of the Home Office are examined many instances will be found in which, by the exertions of former sheriffs, the lives of many persons ordered for execution have been saved.' He was well authorized to say so.

This most inestimable gentleman is still alive, so we may not speak of him as we sincerely feel; but we shall chronicle his acts—they are his best eulogy. During the seven months of Mr. Wilde's shrievalty, he saved the lives of six innocent persons who had been actually ordered for execution! The records and the documents are at the Home Office. The first case was that of Anderson and Morris, accused and convicted of robbery with violence. To avoid prolixity we omit the particulars, which will be found in the former editions. It was not until the day for their execution was near its dawn the respite was granted. At dark midnight, when on their knees expecting the fatal approach of the official to warn them that their hour was at hand, mercy's own messenger appeared with the assurance of their safety. It was as the angel's visit, and their chains fell off—they were wholly 'pardoned.' The next is a case so monstrous that it is difficult of credence; still it is true. At a time when juries, aghast at the frequent executions for forgery, insisted upon such strictness of proof as to make conviction almost impossible, and acquitted very often where the proof was perfect, a man named Smith pleaded guilty to the charge. All remonstrance was lost on him; his friends in vain advised him; in vain the Judge urged him to take his trial; he persisted in his plea, and sentence of death was passed on him. In due time he was ordered for execution; the condemned sermon was actually preached. In such a crisis, the indefatigable sheriff was appealed to by a respectable tradesman of Cornhill, the prisoner's relative. He proceeded to the dreadful cell of the condemned, with a heavy heart, because apparently on a hopeless mission. There, however, he heard the explanation of his plea—the frightful explanation! His case was instituted by the Bankers' Committee. Some short time before the sessions, their solicitor authorized Mr. Cope, then City Marshal, to assure Smith that if he pleaded guilty his life should be saved. He did so—relying on that promise—and now behold him on his truckle bed, within four days of his execution. The sheriff, scarcely crediting his senses, hurried to the Home Office, and there, as usual, was met by the prompt humanity of Sir Robert Peel. The Minister, as much astounded as the sheriff, at once solicited the aid of Lord Lyndhurst, then Lord Chancellor —a rare combination. A most vigilant investigation instantly ensued; prosecutor, solicitor, City Marshal, and others were summoned to the Lord Chancellor's private room at the House of Lords, and underwent a strict examination. The sheriff's narrative was true. The life of Smith was saved. This awful detail is on record at the Home Office; and, reader, this occurred in the metropolis of England and in the nineteenth century! The third case was one of two poor men—humble, destitute Irishmen—convicted on circumstantial evidence of a revolting crime. On a patient scrutiny at the Home Office, the prosecution was shown to have been the result of a conspiracy. This appeared, partly by the improbability of the prosecutor's story, and partly by direct evidence submitted to the Secretary of State. The men's lives were saved; and, says the sheriff, 'I have no doubt of their innocence.' The last case was that of a man named Brown, capitally convicted of robbery and left for execution. He was saved; but not, says the generous sheriff—ever seeking to despoil himself of the meed of his humanity—'until his master, Mr. Lingham, a wine merchant, had been exerting himself for many days to procure a remission of the sentence.' Here, then, were the lives of six of his fellow-creatures saved, through the instrumentality of one noble-minded man, in little more than the moiety of a shrievalty."

Mr. John Stuart Mill declared, when the question was formerly under discussion, that if it could be proved that juries were unwilling to convict in cases of murder, and that guilty men escaped in consequence, he would give up the whole question. On this subject he had evidence which he could not doubt would be satisfactory to the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Denman) was asked by the Duke of Richmond—on the late Royal Commission—"What is the opinion which you have formed, generally, upon the question of capital punishments?" He replied—

"The conclusion which I have come to is, that the chief way in which it operates is as a most powerful weapon in the hands of any counsel defending a prisoner, and that it leads to the acquittal of a great many men who, if there were any punishment but death as the result of a trial for murder, would most certainly be convicted."

He adduced cases in his own experience, and amongst others the trial of John White, for the murder of his wife, at the Lewes Assizes, in 1859—

"The jury found him guilty of manslaughter only, to the evident surprise of every one in court, the prisoner himself, who had evidently made up his mind for the worst, included."

Mr. Serjeant Parry stated, in reply to a question by Mr. Waddington—

"I could mention six or eight instances within my own knowledge in which men have been acquitted purely upon the ground that the punishment was capital."

In reply to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright), the learned gentleman said—

"I know that juries have acquitted men, clearly, and, beyond all doubt, guilty of murder, and some of the very worst murders that have ever been committed in this country, and have done so simply because the punishment has been the punishment of death; they would have convicted if the punishment had been imprisonment for life, or any punishment short of taking the life of the man, and they have seized hold of any excuses rather than be agents in putting capital punishment into operation."

That is not unreasonable. For a man, if wrongly transported—as in the case of Mr. Barber, the solicitor—can afterwards have compensation made, but not so if wrongly hanged. Thus it occurs that not unfrequently murderers escape conviction sorely against the feeling both of the public and of the jurors themselves. At the Maidstone Assizes, July, 1865, two acquittals greatly astonished the public. One of these was the case of Thomas Jones, tried for the murder of his child at Woolwich. It was proved that the child had been given to the prisoner alive and well, and that it was found in the Thames dead, and with a weight tied to it to prevent its floating. Other evidence was given which all tended to show that the prisoner was guilty of murder. Everybody in Court was confident that Jones must be found guilty, and the black cap had been placed within reach of the Judge to be put on. But the jury greatly surprised the court by a verdict of "Not guilty." The prisoner immediately fell down insensible in the dock. In many cases jurors have openly acknowledged that they had refused to convict because the penalty was capital. One of the jurors empanelled to try the six persons charged (March 1856) with the peculiarly brutal murder at Matfen, near Newcastle, was remonstrated with by a gentleman, who expressed the astonishment of himself, and of the local public generally, at the verdict of acquittal then returned. The juror admitted that he and his associates believed the charge to have been substantiated, but added, that there was not absolute certainty; and, said he, "We could not consent to hang six persons except on perfectly certain evidence." Lord Cranworth, in reply to a question by Mr. Justice O'Hagan, admitted—

> "I have known one or two instances in which the prisoner was tried for murder, which, to my mind, was clearly made out; but nevertheless he was acquitted, and I believe the acquittal was because the jury did not like to convict in a case where capital punishment would follow. I have observed that."

Sir George Grey, in his evidence, quoted the following:—

> "There is one remarkable case which occurred at Winchester not long ago, in which a man was tried for the murder of a woman. There was every presumptive evidence of his being the guilty person, and I believe nobody entertained any doubt as to his guilt; but the jury asked the Judge in that case whether they could find a verdict of manslaughter. The Judge said, 'No; it is either murder or nothing,' and they found a verdict of not guilty. I think that they would have found a verdict of manslaughter if they could."

There was the case of the boy Challoner, in Canada, who, to avenge an outrage offered to his sister, followed an officer into the field where his troop was at exercise, and shot him dead with a pistol. Though there was no doubt whatever about the facts, and it was known that he had repeatedly threatened to serve the officer out, he was found not guilty, and at once set at liberty. This and other cases fully bore out the opinions of the learned counsel which he had read, and who were men as well capable of forming an opinion as the Judges themselves, and who had declared their belief that in very many cases it was impossible to procure a conviction from juries. He maintained that capital punishment did not deter crime on account of the uncertainty of the punishment. It failed to produce any check in the case of the Fenians, for the pistol of Manchester by which a policeman was shot, was echoed by the powder barrel at Clerkenwell, and from the moment of Barratt's conviction of this offence to the day of his execution, the enormity of the crime was lost in pity for the criminal; and it was to the fact that Fenianism was made treason-felony in Ireland, and not high treason, that they could attribute the convictions that had taken place in that country. Did any hon. Member believe that had treason-felony been capital any convictions would have been obtained? In conversation with a learned Judge who took a different view of the question of capital punishment to himself, his Lordship said, "If you only saw the class of men brought before us you would be convinced that nothing but capital punishment would deter them;" but, strange to say, the present law did not deter them from committing murder. What we wanted was a punishment. He wanted the punishment to be so certain that it would prevent the committal of those offences, and not so uncertain that there were 250 chances to one that a man who committed murder would not be executed. Four of the Royal Commissioners were in favour of the abolition of capital punishment. Mr. Justice O'Hagan was in favour of its abolition, but he doubted if public opinion was ripe for it; but he (Mr. Gilpin) begged to tell that learned Judge that public opinion was in advance of him, the Home Office, and the Government, on this subject. Of late years there had been some remarkable instances of distinguished persons who had avowed a change in their opinions on the subject. Mr. Waddington, the late Under Secretary of the Home Office, came to the conclusion that capital punishment must be abolished. Earl Russell, who had through a long life opposed this measure, expressed himself, in the introduction to the new edition of his work on *The English Constitution*, as being favourable to the abolition of capital punishment—

"For my own part, I do not doubt for a moment either the right of a community to inflict the punishment of death, or the expediency of exercising that right in certain states of society. But when I turn from that abstract right and that abstract expediency to our own state of society—when I consider how difficult it is for any Judge to separate the case which requires inflexible justice from that which admits the force of mitigating circumstances—how invidious the task of the Secretary of State in dispensing the mercy of the Crown—how critical the comments made by the public—how soon the object of general horror becomes the theme of sympathy and pity—how narrow and how limited the examples given by this condign and awful punishment—how brutal the scene at the execution—I come to the conclusion that nothing would be lost to justice, nothing lost in the preservation of innocent life, if the punishment of death were altogether abolished. In that case a sentence of a long term of separate confinement, followed by another term of hard labour and hard fare, would cease to be considered as an extension of mercy. If the sentence of the Judge were to that effect, there would scarcely ever be a petition for remission of punishment, in cases of murder, sent to the Home Office. The guilty, unpitied, would have time and opportunity to turn repentant to the Throne of Mercy."

With regard to the probable effect of the abolition of capital punishment in diminishing crime, he would quote from a speech of his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade the testimony of local governors of States in the American Union—

"In the State of Rhode Island, one of the small States of America, with a population of not more than 200,000, capital punishment has been abolished. The Governor, the Hon. J. Pye Smith, writing from the Executive Department, March 21, 1864, says—

"'1. The death penalty was abolished in this State in the year 1852. 2. I do not think its abolition has had any effect upon the security of life. 3. Is the law against the death penalty sustained by the public opinion of the State?—Very decidedly. 4. Are convictions and punishments more certain than before the change was made?—I think they are. 5. What is the punishment now inflicted on such criminals as were formerly punished with death?—Imprisonment for life at hard labour. I have conversed with one supreme Judge, State attorney, and warden of the State prison, and they support my own established views upon the subject."

"In a second letter, dated April 4, he says:—'Our present able Chief Justice says:—"Although disposed to the present law when passed, I am equally opposed to a change in it until the experiment has been tried long enough to satisfy us that it has failed. I am clearly of opinion that the present state of the law is sustained by public opinion, and I believe it will continue to be until it is satisfactorily shown that crimes against life have been considerably increased in consequence of it. My observation fully justifies me in saying that conviction for murder is far more certain now in proper cases than when death was the punishment of it."'

"Here is the answer received from the Hon. Austin Blair, the Governor of the State of Michigan:—'1. The death penalty for murder was abolished March 1, 1847, when the revised statutes of 1846 went into effect. 2. Life is not considered less secure than before; murders are probably less frequent in proportion to population. Twenty years ago the population of the State was 300,000, and we have now a population of about 900,000. Then it was chiefly agricultural, and now we have mines of copper, iron, coal, &c., bringing into proximity dissimilar classes, and increasing the probabilities of frequent crime. Before the abolition of the death penalty murders were not unfrequent, but convictions were rarely or never obtained. It became the common belief that no jury could be found (the prisoner availing himself of the common law right of challenge) which would convict. Since the abolition there have been in seventeen years thirty-seven convictions. 3. There can be no doubt that public opinion sustains the present law and is against the restoration of the death penalty. 4. Conviction and punishment are now much more certain than before the change was made. Murder requires a greater amount of proof than any other crime, and it is found practically that a trial for murder excites no very unusual interest.'

"It therefore does not make a hero of the criminal. The letter proceeds:—'5. The punishment now is solitary confinement at hard labour for life. Since 1861 this class of prisoners have been employed as other prisoners, as it was found difficult to keep them at work in cells without giving them tools, and there was danger of their becoming insane. The reform has been successfully tried, and is no longer an experiment.'

"The last letter is from the Hon. J. S. Lewis, the Governor of Wisconsin, and is dated March 29, 1864:—'The evil tendency of public executions, the great aversion of many to the taking of life rendering it almost impossible to obtain jurors from the more intelligent portion of the community, the liability of the innocent to suffer so extreme a penalty and be placed beyond the reach of the pardoning power, and the disposition of courts and juries not to convict, fearing the innocent might suffer, convinced me that this relic of barbarism should be abolished. The death penalty was repealed in 1853. No legislation has since re-established it, and the people find themselves equally secure, and the public more certain

> than before. The population in 1850 was 305,000; in 1860 it was 775,000. With this large increase of population, we might expect a large increase of criminal cases; but this does not appear to be the case."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 2098-9.]

He would only trouble the House with one quotation further; but it was an important one, from Professor Upham, of Maine—

> "Kennebunkport, Maine, May 4, 1869.
>
> "My dear Sir,—The law of Maine in relation to capital punishment, which has been on the statute book for thirty-five years, remains unaltered; I think you have a copy of it. During that time there have been four executions within the limits of the State; two by the authority of the national courts for crimes punishable with death, committed on the high seas; in cases of which kind, if I understand it rightly, the United States courts and laws have exclusive jurisdiction, just as they would have exclusive jurisdiction in cases of treason against the United States. In case of crimes punishable with death under the authority of the State, if the person is convicted, he cannot be executed until the expiration of a year, and then the law leaves the matter in the hands of the governor, who may either leave the criminal in prison, or if in his judgment the public good requires it, order him to be executed. During the long period of about thirty-five years, two only have been put to death under the State laws; one for attempting the life of the warden of the State prison, and the other for special atrocities in the crime for which he was convicted, the peculiar circumstances in each case furnishing a justification to the people of a course on the part of the executive authority which is practically obsolete. The people of Maine feel as safe under their system as any people in the world. But we have two powerful auxiliaries. Firstly, we keep the school-houses open; secondly, we keep the dram-shops shut. I know of no State that has returned to capital punishment after having once abolished it. Education, temperance, just laws, and light taxation, and, above all, a true and living religious sentiment, do more for the protection of the people than the death penalty.
>
> "Respectfully yours,
>
> "THOMAS C. UPHAM."

He had only now to thank the House for the attention they had paid to a long and, he feared, tiresome speech, on a subject of great importance. He wanted, if he could, to purge the English statute book of its blood law, to improve and increase the security of society, and wipe away from the House and the country the danger and the fearful responsibility of shedding innocent blood. He wanted to make convictions more certain, and to make punishment follow more surely on crime; to save his right hon. Friend and the Home Office from the perpetual misery of having to decide on the guilt or innocence of a criminal, respecting whom the utmost exertions are used to save him from death; and to bring our laws into greater conformity with the spirit and precept of Him, "who yet willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live." The time would speedily come, when the scaffold would be gathered to its kindred —the rack, the thumb-screw, and the Scavenger's Daughter—

> "Luke's iron crown, and Damien's bed of fire,"

and other relics of a regretted past abhorred of man and reprobate of Heaven.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, after the eloquent and exhaustive speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton, he must ask the indulgence of the House in rising to support a cause which in former years had been advocated from these Benches by no less eminent a Member of the Conservative party than his right hon. and learned Friend the present Lord Chief Baron. He believed that the uncertainty of the punishment was a great reason for the increase of the crime. The relaxation of the law of capital punishments in this country had been found to work well. He had been deeply impressed, several years ago, by the account of a speech, given in the life of his illustrious father, Sir T. F. Buxton, by his hon. Friend the Member for East Surrey. Some fifty years ago Sir. T. F. Buxton brought the then state of the law, as regards capital punishment, before the House, and mentioned that the linen bleachers had petitioned for an alteration in the capital punishment in regard to offences against them. Parliament acceded to the Petition in the spirit described by the poet—

> "Evertere domos totas optantibus ipsis,
> Dii faciles;"

and the result was that the robbery of linen bleaching grounds had become extinct. He had been very much impressed with the circumstances mentioned in the book, and he had made inquiries as to what had been the result of capital punishment in other cases. At that time our law was written in letters of blood. He had a great veneration for the memory of Lord Eldon and Lord Ellenborough; but we must bear in mind that they lived at a period when public opinion was rendered reckless of life by a long European war. He had obtained statistics from the blue book, on capital punishment, which showed the percentage of convictions for certain crimes in the ten years, from 1826 to 1835, when capital punishment was in full operation for all sorts of crimes, and the percentage of convictions in the ten years, from 1854 to 1863, when capital punishment was abolished in all cases except murder. In the first period, out of every 100 committals for forgery there were sixty-two convictions; for arson, twenty-five convictions out of every 100 committals; for rape, sixteen convictions; for assaults with intent, sixty-one convictions; and for sodomy, twenty-one convictions. In the latter period, from 1854 to 1863, the convictions for forgery were 80 per cent of the committals; for arson, 56 per cent; for rape, 39 per cent; for assaults with intent, 67 per cent; and for sodomy, 32 per cent. The percentage of convictions had also increased in the case of horse-stealing, sheep-stealing, and cattle-stealing. Those figures bore out the argument that where capital punishment was inflicted juries were very unwilling to convict, and that the certainty of punishment was much greater where death did not result. Another set of statistics showed the number of convictions and executions for wilful murder only in England and Wales since 1861, when attempted murder ceased to be a capital offence. In 1862, there were twenty-nine convictions and fifteen executions; in 1863, twenty-nine convictions and twenty-two executions; in 1864, thirty-two convictions and nineteen executions; in 1865, twenty convictions and eight executions; in 1866, twenty-six convictions and twelve executions; and in 1867, twenty-seven convictions and ten executions. The House would, therefore, not be surprised to find that, as only a small proportion of those sentenced to death were executed, the feeling among the criminal population was that for murder there was a very good chance of escaping punishment. Deterrence depended entirely on certainty of conviction and punishment, and the uncertainty which attached to the present state of the law as regarded both was, in fact, a great inducement to crime. Under the old law a great portion of the executions were for forgery. Now, as a banker, he belonged to a class deeply interested in the suppression of forgery; but he fearlessly stated—and he would appeal to the hon. Member for Shaftesbury (Mr. Glyn) for confirmation—that nothing would induce the banking community to return to the old law. He did not see the Governor of the Bank of England (Mr. Crawford) in his place, or he should confidently make a similar appeal to him. Some people connected with the Bank of England used at one time to boast that they had procured the execution of thirty persons per year for the forgery of £1 notes. They must all rejoice, however, that capital punishment in these cases had been abolished, and he was sure that no member of the mercantile community would wish to return to the old state of things. It was true that the old degrading exhibition of public executions had ceased to exist; but it was a mistake to suppose that executions had a deterrent effect, for he could quote the evidence of a chaplain of great experience in gaols, that out of some hundred cases in every instance, except four, in which a person was executed, that person had witnessed a public execution before committing his own crime. The statement that juries hesitated to convict was fully borne out by the number of cases in which they returned verdicts of acquittal; and that made the argument irresistible, that the present system had the very opposite effect to that which was intended. The operation of the Home Office in these cases demanded consideration; and here he wished to speak with the utmost respect of the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Department. He had not the honour of any private acquaintance with the right hon. Gentleman, nor had he the good fortune to be a member of the party of which the right hon. Gentleman was so distinguished an ornament. At the same time, he had been greatly impressed with the dignity, the courtesy, and the ability with which the right hon. Gentleman transacted the business of his Department in the House. He therefore hoped it would be understood that in blaming the system he meant no disrespect to the present Home Secretary, in whom he had as full confidence as he could have in any man in such matters. He might say the same of the right hon. Gentleman's three predecessors (Sir George Grey, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. G. Hardy). All four of these Gentlemen, apart from the question of party, had possessed the entire confidence of Parliament, and had carried out their duties with singular ability. He wished it to be understood that, in finding fault with the system of the Home Office, he was still of opinion that there was no public man to whom its administration might be more safely delegated than the right hon. Gentleman who now filled the Office of Home Secretary. When the present law was passed, it was intended that when a man was publicly tried and convicted the sentence of the Judge should be carried out. But in consequence of the great change in public feeling, immediately a man was sentenced to death constant appeals were made to the Home Office, and his ultimate fate did not depend on a public tribunal, but on a secret and irresponsible one in the Home Office. He might instance the case of Palmer, of Rugeley, the notorious poisoner, than whom a greater villain was not to be found in the history of crime. He was tried by three most learned and most eminent Judges; the trial was conducted by the most able men at the Bar—including the present Lord Chief Justice—it lasted for a fortnight; the prisoner was found guilty; public opinion endorsed that verdict; but from the day sentence was passed to the day of execution, the Home Secretary was persecuted by memorials on the ground that there was some uncertainty as to whether the scientific evidence could be relied on. It seemed to him most undesirable that the life of a human being should hang on the judgment of one man, however able he might be. The Home Secretary had to decide on evidence which was communicated to him, but which was frequently not known to the public; and the public were often left to wonder why it was that the Home Secretary reprieved one man and executed another; and in that way a most invidious duty was placed on the Home Secretary, which it was impossible that he could discharge with satisfaction to the public or to himself. It had been often argued that there was no sufficient punishment to substitute for capital punishment; and this argument had been put forward by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley); but he might cite the opinion of no less eminent an authority than Sir Walter Crofton, that imprisonment for life might take the place of the death penalty. The Capital Punishment Commission made several recommendations in their Report on this subject; but only one of these recommendations—that for the carrying out of executions privately—had yet been acted upon. That was, no doubt, a most desirable and useful reform; but if capital punishment was to continue to be enforced, the other recommendations of the Royal Commissioners should also be carried out. On these grounds, because he believed that capital punishment led to uncertainty of conviction; because he objected to place the life of a human being in the hands of a secret and irresponsible tribunal; he gave his cordial and earnest support to this Bill, the second reading of which he had the honour to second.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Gilpin.*)

Mr. J. D. LEWIS, in moving that the Bill be read a second time this day three months, said, the question was one which had occupied his anxious attention for some years, and he was glad to hear his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Gilpin) base his Motion on the only practical and intelligible ground on which it could be based—that the abolition of capital punishment would diminish the number of murders and prevent crime. There were two main points for consideration. First, was there an unwillingness on the part of juries to convict? If so, that was tantamount to saying that death punishment was inconsistent with the public feeling on the subject, and then unquestionably they ought to accede to the second reading of this Bill. The other question was, what had been the result of the change in the law now advocated where it had occurred in countries resembling, in some degree, our own? He agreed with his hon. Friend in stating that he would not take the opinion of a Judge as to the advisability of doing away with capital punishment, for the Judge's opinion on such a point would be no better than that of any other man; but the opinion of a Judge was entitled to some weight on the question as to whether there was any difficulty in getting a jury to convict in murder cases. Five Judges were examined before the Commissioners, and they all bore testimony to the fact that there was no difficulty in getting convictions in murder cases. Those Judges were Lord Wensleydale, Lord

Cranworth, Baron Martin, Baron Bramwell, and Justice Willes, and Lord Cranworth was the only one who remembered a single case in his experience in which a jury had acquitted a prisoner on account of their objection to capital punishment. The legal authorities who supported an opposite view on this point before the Commissioners were mainly two — the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton (Mr. Denman) and Sir FitzRoy Kelly, and Sir FitzRoy Kelly had only been engaged in one murder case in the whole course of his life. The balance of evidence was therefore very strongly in favour of juries being willing to convict. As to the second point, he had received a circular from the Society for Promoting the Abolition of Capital Punishment, giving the results of the abolition of capital punishment in other countries; but it was remarkable that Tuscany was not mentioned in the document. In Tuscany capital punishment had been abolished for some years, and it had been followed by a large increase in the crime of murder, and especially in cases of murder committed for the mere sake of plunder. He could cite the case of a Swiss canton — Neuchâtel — in which capital punishment was abolished, where nineteen murders occurred in the fifteen years preceding the change, the average population of the canton being 90,000; and forty-five murders took place in the fifteen years succeeding the change, the average population being 100,000. That certainly was not an encouragement to proceed in the direction of doing away with the punishment of death. Crossing the Atlantic, he quite admitted that this punishment had been successfully abolished in one or two States; but the condition of society in those States ought to be borne in mind in connection with the fact of the abolition of death, for it was of material importance. What was that condition? Why, it was the custom to appoint what were called "vigilance committees," who strung up, without trial, murderers, garotters, and rowdies, in order to deter others from following criminal pursuits. If such a state of society existed in this country, and the citizens of London had the power of executing summary punishment upon the pests of humanity, the passing of such a Bill as that under discussion would not be a matter of such importance. But if the present law were repealed, he believed one of the greatest deterrents to crime would be removed. When he was travelling in Rhode Island, a schoolmaster committed some misbehaviour in regard to a young girl who was one of his pupils, whereupon her father and brother went out armed with firearms, with the avowed intention of shooting him if they could find him. He was assured that if they killed him they would not be brought to trial for the murder. It was therefore not a good argument to point to it and to the United States, where such customs prevailed, as favourable examples of the good resulting from the abolition of capital punishment. He believed that the abolition of that punishment would not only remove a great deterrent of crime, but it would also operate most unfavourably in another direction. Men who had committed murder might possibly reform during their imprisonment, and a strong cry and agitation would be got up against the cruelty of keeping a man incarcerated for a lifetime. The consequence would be that persons like Rush, Manning, Greenacre, and others, would be met walking about the streets of London as reformed characters. He, for one, should strongly object to be a resident in any place where such characters went about at large. He was not adverse to the carrying out of the recommendations of the Commission of 1865-6; but he altogether objected to the Bill as it stood. If it were carried, a corresponding change would have to be made in the scale of all punishments. It would never be tolerated that a ticket-of-leave man who broke into a house and stole the plate, but without doing any personal violence to any one, should be sentenced to penal servitude for life, while another man who committed a burglary, in which he had cut the throats of a man and his wife, and perhaps, in addition, thrown the maid-servant over the balusters, was sentenced to the same punishment. No young Member of that House would willingly choose such a subject for his first speech; and he could assure the House that it was only from a sense of duty he now moved that this Bill be read a second time that day three months.

MR. TIPPING, in seconding the Amendment, said, to his mind the real practical question which they had to consider was, whether in highly populous countries there was or was not a certain incorrigible class whom nothing but the punishment of death would deter from the commission of murder. If there were such a class—and it seemed to him that there was—he thought capital punishment ought not to be abolished. He did not believe that criminals had a greater horror of penal servitude for life than of death. Numberless cases that had actually occurred could be quoted to the contrary. At the same time, the more we could narrow and confine that punishment to the class of premeditated and cold-blooded murders the better. The crime of murder required further and more precise definition; but capital punishment was the specific and natural preventive of cold-blooded and premeditated murders. He feared that the reluctance of juries to find a prisoner guilty of murder under the present state of the law was a proof of the enervating and emasculating tendency of the day. The jury took an oath to give a verdict according to the evidence, and the result of their verdict was nothing to them, seeing that they were not responsible for the laws. With respect to the argument that forgery had decreased since the abolition of capital punishment for that offence, he thought the decrease was due rather to the improved means of detection since the days of Fauntleroy than to the alteration in the punishment. He, for one, was not prepared to destroy the musical scale of finality in punishment, by depriving it of its great and final note. As he did not believe that capital punishment either led or induced to crime, he should oppose the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. J. D. Lewis.*)

Mr. Serjeant SIMON denied that the question of abolishing capital punishment was only mooted by the Society of Friends. It had extended far beyond that respectable body, and now found advocates amongst the members of every religious denomination and of every shade of political opinion. The feeling against capital punishment was a growing feeling, and the question was one of juridical science, with which the Legislature would have to deal on high moral as well as practical considerations. The great object of punishment was stated by all philosophical jurists to be —first, the correction of the offender; and, secondly, to deter others from committing the offence. It could not be denied that capital punishment failed in the first object, because you could not correct a man by putting him to death. In the second place, capital punishment was not a deterrent against murder. Human life seemed to him so sacred that the State was not justified in taking it away unless an overwhelming case were made out for its necessity; and he did not believe that such a necessity existed. One of his great objections to capital punishment was, that if they made a mistake they could not undo it, they could not make atonement to the sufferer. He could enjoy even the solace of knowing that the stain had been wiped away from his name, and that the infamy of the sentence had been removed. Another objection was the uncertainty of the punishment, for the deterrent effect of any punishment depended much more upon its certainty than upon its severity. Some persons disbelieved in the unwillingness of juries to convict; but his own experience caused him to differ from that opinion. Those who attended the criminal trials must recollect how in cases of murder, owing to the nature of the punishment, the most solemn appeals were made by the counsel for the prisoners to the juries, and how those appeals shook the feelings and judgment of the strongest men. When certain death was the consequence of their verdict juries were cautious—indeed, more than cautious—in pronouncing it. How could his hon. Friend distinguish bad cases of murder from other cases. He supposed he referred to murders of unusual atrocity; but was it not equally atrocious, for example, for a woman during a series of months to administer slow poison to her husband? Juries were often influenced by the consideration that the criminal was a woman, and yet no case could be more hideous than such a case of slow poisoning. When reference was made to the effects resulting from the abolition of capital punishment in foreign countries it should be remembered that there, as in this country, in cases where capital punishment was abolished, there was apparently an increase of crime, because the convictions were more numerous. He should not object to see a reformed criminal walking the streets, and such an expectation should, in his opinion, be an additional reason for supporting the Bill. Another objection he had, it might be said, was of a religious character. People believed in a future state, and were taught that their lives should be spent in preparing to meet death as a joyful passage to eternity. The punishment of death set that principle at nought; it stamped death as a terrible punishment, as a degrading and infamous thing, and surrounded with every circumstance of shame and contempt. His hon. Friend who had moved the Amendment (Mr. J. D. Lewis) stated that the Legislature could not persist in outraging public feeling by keeping any man in prison for life; but he differed from his hon. Friend upon that point. He believed that society would be anything but hostile to the perpetual imprisonment of a man who had committed an atrocious murder. His own belief was that the time had gone by for the preservation of capital punishment, which seemed to partake more of the character of retribution than of what should be the true motive of the State in inflicting punishment. Believing, as the result of personal experience, that capital punishment did not act any more as a deterrent than a secondary punishment would do; that it led to great uncertainty, and induced hope of escape in the criminal; and that it placed the Home Secretary very often in positions of great difficulty and uncertainty, making him the arbiter between life and death, he thought it would be a change for the better if it were abolished altogether.

MR. SCOURFIELD dissented from the proposition that the first object of punishment was the reformation of the offender.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had explained that there were two primary objects of punishment as laid down by the highest legal authorities—first, the correction of the offender; and next, the deterring example.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, that anyone who had ever had occasion to sentence a prisoner to imprisonment must have felt, in doing so, that there was very little chance of the criminal being reformed, though he knew that during the period of incarceration society would be safe. Two questions had been mixed up in this discussion which ought to be kept perfectly distinct — one was the question of capital punishment, and the other was the action of the Home Office. As regarded the functions of the Home Secretary, that subject had been treated some years ago in so exhaustive a manner by the late Sir George Lewis, that he felt it unnecessary to do more than refer hon. Members to that speech, which he always regretted had not been published in a separate form. As to the sentence of death, it was said by hon. Members that it admitted of no reversal. But what sentence was it possible to pass without producing consequences which it was impossible to reverse? Some of the punishments which had been suggested as substitutes for the penalty of death could never practically be carried out. With all the horror that he entertained of taking human life, he would far rather sentence a person to death than to perpetual solitary imprisonment; for while you had no right, according to some, to divorce the soul from the human body, you had still less right to debase the soul and reduce a human being to the level of a brute. Whatever system might be adopted, it would always be necessary, he thought, to keep on foot the punishment of death to meet cases of the highest atrocity. It must be remembered that we lived in a sensational age, when our sympathies were liable to be strongly excited by passing events, and when great virtues and great vices equally caught hold of the public mind. A man in a comparatively humble position, struggling hard to pay his debts and to overcome difficulties, attracted little attention, and passed away very often with few to assist him. But a man who was guilty of fraud on a gigantic scale, or who committed a murder under picturesque circumstances, was apt to become an object of sympathy on the part of the public, who frequently laid more stress on the sanctity of human life where the murderer was concerned than in the case of the person whom he had murdered. He had been much struck some years ago by an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, which contained a quotation from the pages of a French author to this effect:—"By all means let capital punishment be abolished; let reverence for human life be observed, but"—to use the French expression—"*Que messieurs les assassins commencent.*"

Mr. HIBBERT supported the Amendment, though not because he was satisfied with the present state of the law. While cases of brutality and atrocity were so frequent, and when so much carelessness of human life was exhibited, he was not prepared to vote for the abolition of capital punishment. Some alteration of the law was necessary; but they ought to proceed gradually to limit the operation of capital punishment. Had there been opportunity on the previous evening it was his intention, therefore, to have given notice of the following Amendment:—

> "That it is not desirable to proceed with the second reading of this Bill till the recommendations of the Capital Punishment Commission in reference to the punishment of murder have been further considered by Parliament."

The Commissioners had paid very great attention to this subject, and when the position and character of those Commissioners—including the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), and the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Board of Trade—were considered, the greatest weight must be attached to their conclusions. The Commissioners held that a change was necessary in the definition of murder, and one of the alternatives suggested by them was that there should be two classes of murder, and that the punishment of death should be applicable only to those of the first degree, where murder was committed with malice aforethought, while in other cases there should be punishment by penal servitude for life. If such a proposition were carried into law it would get rid of many of the cases of uncertainty referred to in the debate; it would relieve juries of much trouble, and the Home Secretary of some of the most difficult business he had to perform. He wished to narrow into a small compass the cases in which capital punishment should be inflicted. As to the punishment of penal servitude for life, there was now no penal servitude for life which was carried out for life. There was almost a certainty of a man so convicted being remitted out on leave at the end of twenty years. Were hon. Members prepared to establish a state of things in which every man who had committed a murder should be loosed upon society at the expiration of such a period? It was quite possible, however, to establish in some secluded part of the country a prison where criminals could be kept for life; in Belgium, and one or two other foreign countries, prisons existed where men had been detained for twenty-five or even thirty years without detriment to their health. He believed, with the late Sir Samuel Romilly, that public security did require the retention of the punishment of death. He sympathized in the desire of his hon. Friend to humanize the law, and should be ready to assist him, and he thought much progress had been made in public feeling on this subject. He trusted that his right hon. Friend at the Home Office would give some promise that he would undertake to legislate on the recommendations of the Capital Punishment Commissioners, or otherwise carry out some plan for altering the definition of the law of murder.

Mr. BRUCE said, he felt sure the House would agree with him that his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Gilpin) had no need to make any apology. All who heard the speech would admit that it was powerful and eloquent, and that it had in it the best of all the ingredients of eloquence—that of earnestness. In opposing the Motion upon the second reading, he was not about to do so on the ground that the present law was perfect or in a satisfactory state; the arguments which had been adduced by various speakers, whether they supported or opposed the Bill, were conclusive upon that point. What were the facts with regard to the sentence of death for murder? During the last six years, apart from the present year, 155 sentences of death were pronounced, of which only eighty-two were executed. Of the remaining seventy-three, but twenty were cases of infanticide; there were, accordingly, fifty-three cases in which the punishment of death was remitted, or exchanged for some other punishment. Forty-four of these were sentenced to penal servitude for life, one for fifteen years, one for ten years, one for one year, four were pardoned, one became a lunatic after his sentence and before the time came for execution, and one committed suicide who would otherwise have suffered. It was impossible to assert that this was a proper or satisfactory state of things, and he would undertake to say that the law could not exist at all were it not for the large discretionary power intrusted to the Home Secretary, which devolved upon him duties, not only of the most difficult, but of the most painful character. It was hard, for instance, to justify the continued existence of a law under which it was not merely in the power, but became absolutely the duty of the Secretary of State to remit sentences of death solemnly passed by a Judge after verdict found by the jury. In accordance with long tradition in his Office, it was the duty of the Home Secretary to remit the extreme sentence in all cases of infanticide. Another custom which had grown to be invariable—at least he had not been able to find a single exception—was that no sentence of death was ever inflicted in a case where, in the opinion of the Judge, it ought not to be inflicted. Everybody acquainted with the subject must be aware that after every Assize there were Judges who hastened to inform the Home Secretary that although, according to the definition of law, the jury had been right in finding the prisoner guilty of murder, and although the Judge was himself bound to pass sentence of death, yet, in his opinion, that sentence ought not to be carried into execution. Then no inconsiderable number of cases arose where the Judge passed sentence of death, himself disagreeing with the jury. In the two latter classes of cases, the Home Secretary, whether he agreed with the opinion of the Judge or not, was bound, according to the practice, to abandon his own opinion and act upon that of the Judge—morally bound, he meant, of course, for there was no legal obligation resting upon him beyond the precedents invariably recognized by his predecessors. A third class of cases, extremely difficult to deal with, and exposing the holder of the Office to comments, harsh and very frequently unjust, was when fresh evidence arose after the conviction of the offender; and he must say that, in his opinion, this was the weakest part of our present system, and one deserving the most serious consideration of the Legislature. The case was that of a very poor class of persons, who either were unable to obtain legal assistance, or, from their position or perhaps from their previous character, excited but little sympathy in the neighbourhood, and facts which might have told in their favour were not brought out till the consciences of those acquainted with those facts were aroused by the impending death of the convicts. Cases such as these were by no means infrequent. In his short experience he had already had two or three signal instances in which evidence of the most undoubted importance had been kept back, either from want of means on the part of the prisoner to have his case properly investigated, or from want of interest on the part of those by whom the evidence could be given. One of the first cases he had to adjudicate upon was that of the convict Bisgrove, the circumstances of the murder being such as in themselves to excite suspicion of insanity. Without any quarrel, or object to gain, he dashed out the brains of a sleeping man, and then went to sleep beside him. On being awakened and told of the murder he went off into a fit, and during the trial he again went into a fit. No evidence was adduced before the Court as to the previous life of this unhappy man; but after sentence had been passed the conscience of the neighbourhood was aroused, and information was given which led to a discovery of what the facts really were—namely, that for three years he had been subject to fits of epilepsy, and, while quite peaceable at other times, under the influence of these he was dangerous, so much so that he had been dismissed from one employment. With a knowledge of these facts, it was impossible to allow the sentence of death to be carried out, and the result of two medical examinations since instituted at different places, and conducted by most competent persons, established that the prisoner was actually insane. These facts showed that there were defects in our law requiring serious consideration, and the application of legislative remedies. His hon. Friend the Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert) suggested the proper answer to this Bill when he invited him to give, on the part of the Government, an undertaking that an attempt would be made to improve the existing state of the law in the manner indicated by the Report of the Royal Commission. He would, however, remind his hon. Friend that the Government of Earl Russell, through their Lord Chancellor (Lord Cranworth), introduced and carried a Bill through the

House of Lords upon this subject; and that, after the change of Government, their successors, not unmindful of their obligations, took up the measure. In consequence, however, of the many imperfections which were pointed out, his right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) withdrew the Bill. And it was within his own knowledge that in the succeeding year another Bill was drawn by the counsel to the Home Office, in which he endeavoured to meet the difficulties raised upon the discussion of the former Bill; but the Bill was not presented, as its provisions did not appear to the Home Secretary fully to meet the objections. His hon. Friend had referred to the recommendations of the Royal Commission; but many of those recommendations had been attacked by some of the ablest writers on Criminal Law, and his own opinion was that, if legislation were possible, as he believed it to be, they must not follow too closely the recommendations of the Royal Commission. As to the measure advocated by his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Gilpin), he must say that neither in his executive nor in his individual capacity was he prepared to adopt the suggestion that in all cases the punishment of death ought to be done away with. He believed the punishment of death to be a very powerful deterrent; and, to say that it did not deter all criminals was no answer whatever, for the same remark might be made of punishments of any and of every kind. Those best acquainted with the criminal classes were of opinion that there were very many of them upon whom the punishment of death exercised a very powerful influence, and who were prevented by the fear of death alone from committing the most atrocious crimes. Of this they had a very strong instance, indeed, in the sister country. He had been repeatedly told, during the late discussions on agrarian outrages in Ireland, that if it were possible to detect one man and punish him with death, these outrages would cease, such having been the experience on former occasions. The facts mentioned in the present discussion with regard to the application of Lynch Law afforded another proof of the deterring effect of capital punishment, though inflicted in a lawless way. It was easy to believe that, if a whole population were well educated and living under the influence of a healthy public opinion, capital punishment might be abrogated without danger. But he was sorry to say we had in all our large cities a certain number of degraded and lawless individuals. It was a fact to be mentioned with shame; but the fact itself was beyond all question, that the tendencies of this class were only kept in check by fear of the most severe punishments. He admitted that public opinion was divided on the subject of capital punishment, and, perhaps, on the whole, the opinion against it was growing. But if there were many cases of persons who had committed atrocious crimes escaping with what would appear to be a light or insufficient penalty, public opinion, he believed, would very soon undergo a change. The hon. Member for Pembrokeshire (Mr. Scourfield) was correct in saying that the punishment of solitary confinement could not be carried beyond a certain extent without endangering the reason of the prisoner; and he understood that the period beyond which that punishment could not safely be continued was about two years. It had been found impossible to retain an effective hold over the conduct of the prisoner when the element of hope was excluded. Under these circumstances, he could not support the second reading of this Bill. His own opinion was, that the action of the Home Office was very much in accordance with the legislation that the majority of Members would wish to see in action. The only sufferer under the present system was the Home Secretary, upon whom it imposed an immense amount of labour and anxiety. He could not agree with those hon. Members who thought they saw a startling discrepancy between the decisions of different Home Secretaries, or even of the same Home Secretary; and he thought that their belief was founded upon a want of minute knowledge of the details of each individual case upon which their theory was founded. He gladly availed himself of that opportunity to vindicate the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Morpeth (Sir George Grey) from charges that had been made with reference to the decision at which he arrived in the cases of Wright and Hall. Wright had formed an illicit connection with a woman with whom he was living, and he seized a weapon and applied it to such a part of her body as showed that he intended to kill her, and the law not recognizing the provocation, the crime was held to be deliberate murder. His right hon. Friend was, in this case, of opinion that, under the circumstances, the law should take effect. As to Hall, he murdered a young woman who, a few days after his marriage, deserted him. He met her in company with the man she had gone to live with, and they both jeered and laughed at him. At her father's house he appealed to her to return to him, promising to pardon all that had occurred, but she refused to return. He then provided himself with a pistol, invited her to take a walk, and deliberately shot her. It was true that in this case there had been a certain amount of premeditation; but, at the same time, there had been intense provocation, and the feeling in Birmingham in favour of the prisoner was so great that the right hon. Gentleman found it to be quite impossible to allow the sentence of the law to be carried into effect. In Winsor's case, again, although the enormity of the offence was undoubted, still the sentence having been postponed for six months in order that important questions of law might be determined, the right hon. Gentleman had thought that it would not be right, after that lapse of time, to permit the prisoner to be executed. It had been suggested that the right hon. Gentleman had left Wright for execution in consequence of having been waited upon by a deputation of 2,000 working men, and because he was afraid that it would be supposed that he had yielded to a menace; but having been Under Secretary for the Home Department at that time, he could state that the right hon. Gentleman had not been influenced by any such unworthy motives. He had indicated, to the best of his ability, what he regarded as being the defects of the present system. He quite agreed that the letter of the law should be brought, as far as possible, into harmony with its practice, and that it was a grave fact that there should be such a discrepancy between the number of persons sentenced to death and those who were executed, as introducing the element of uncertainty; and he also was of opinion that measures should be taken to insure the fullest means of defence to the prisoner. But having said that, he was not prepared to go further; he was not prepared to say that in no case where the fact of desperate and intentional murder had been clearly proved, the punishment of death should not be inflicted. Where the present law had failed was in consequence of a laxity in the rules, by which the crime of murder was defined. Juries, for instance, having refused, against the opinion of the Judge, to convict in cases where the prisoners were drunk at the time of committing the murder. The hon. Member had pointed to those cases as indicating a disposition on the part of juries to shrink from convicting in cases where the offence was punishable capitally; but, in his opinion, it merely showed that the juries were inclined to exercise their own judgment as to what constituted wilful murder. Believing the law to be just in itself, and in accordance with the opinion of the great majority of people in the country; and believing, also, that it would not be safe to abolish capital punishment, he could not support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HADFIELD asked the House to consider whether the crime of murder had increased or decreased; or, in other words, whether the punishment of death had a deterrent effect. The few executions proportionately to the number of sentences showed that there was something wrong in the present state of things. Practically, now, only murder was punished with death, in consequence merely of the discretion exercised at the Home Office, and without any sanction by Parliament. There was now scarcely any case of hanging for infanticide, and as to treason, there would have been no conviction for that crime after the late Fenian disturbances in Ireland if the punishment of disembowelling and quartering was to be inflicted. The softening of the law had been fruitful in diminishing crime; and even if public opinion were at present not advanced to the point of abolishing capital punishment, he had no doubt that it soon would be.

MR. GILPIN, in reply, disavowed any intention to speak disrespectfully of the late Home Secretary (Sir George Grey); no man had greater reason to speak with the highest respect of the ready and careful consideration which that right hon. Gentleman gave to every case that was brought before him; but his object had been only to show that in the case of a rich man there was more power of bringing evidence forward than there was in the case of a poor man. The Home Secretary said that Wright had received only slight provocation; but that provocation was that an infuriate woman dragged him out of bed by the hair of his head. The right hon. Gentleman had also said much as to the deterrent effects of this punishment. In answer to this he would only quote the Rev. John Jessop, who had been ten years chaplain of Horsemonger Lane Gaol. In reply to a question by the Duke of Richmond, he stated—

> "The number of prisoners who come under my observation is very much larger than the number in Newgate."

In 1863 there were committed to Newgate 1,770 prisoners, and to Horsemonger Lane 3,798 prisoners, being 2,028 more than to the former. During the past ten years twenty-eight persons have been committed to Horsemonger Lane Gaol for murder. Mr. Neate, M.P., then asked Mr. Jessop—

> "From your intercourse with the criminal classes, are you not disposed to think that they are not much deterred by capital punishment?"

He replied—

> "I do not think that they are deterred to any appreciable extent. I think that an injury is inflicted upon society by capital punishment, inasmuch as it deteriorates the moral sense of the masses. I think that it brutalizes them."

In answer to questions put by Mr. Waddington, Under Secretary of the Home Office, Mr. Jessop expressed his opinion that penal servitude for life would be, at least, as deterrent as capital punishment to those persons who give any thought to the consequences of their crime; that the majority of the offenders take no thought of the consequences, but reckon upon entire impunity, and that "the great uncertainty renders them entirely reckless." He disputed the statement of his hon. Friend (Mr. Lewis) as to the experience of Tuscany, and reminded him that the Minister of State had been interrogated by a Member who had challenged his statistics, and had admitted errors in them. The Home Secretary, in admitting that Charlotte Winsor could not be executed because six months had elapsed since her trial, had passed as great a censure upon the law as he could do himself. He should certainly divide the House upon the question.

MR. HENLEY said, he did not think that there was any man who in the early part of his life had stronger opinions upon this subject than he had. That opinion was very much created by the expressions of Judges and others, who at that time expressed strong opinions on the subject; but he had watched for a very lengthened period the administration of the law, and he could not resist the logical conclusions from the facts. The Secretary of State for the Home Department had said that, in his opinion, the law was deterrent; and because it was not deterrent in all cases that was no reason why it was not in some. No doubt this was sound reasoning; but when he looked at the whole class of crimes from which the punishment of death had been removed, and was unable to find any increase in this class of crimes over murder, for which the punishment had been retained, he could not bring himself to believe that capital punishment had that deterrent effect that some persons believed it had. The opinions of the Judges and the police were entitled to the greatest weight; but they did not weigh with him against facts. They had now before them the facts of more than thirty years, and he did not think that any one who looked carefully into those facts could maintain that the crimes from which the penalty of death had been removed had thereby increased. As to the crime of rape, perhaps some persons might come to a contrary opinion; but it must be recollected that at the time of the remission of the penalty the evidence that was necessary to prove the crime was materially changed, and that what was previously very difficult to prove had now become comparatively easy. Another matter was this, that as to murder, out of every three persons accused only one was convicted, whilst of all the other classes of crime where three were accused two were convicted. This weighed heavily on his mind, for he believed that if criminals ever calculated at all in reference to punishment the escape from conviction must be a great element of consideration. As to any future dallying with the definition of the law of murder, he was not sanguine that anything could be done in that matter. He must confess that what had been thrown out on that point rather strengthened the conviction of his mind that the simple way of dealing with the difficulty was to get rid of capital punishment altogether. He looked upon this Bill more as an expression of opinion by certain Members in that House, than as a measure at all likely to be enacted, because, at that late period of the Session, it was utterly impossible to believe that it could be passed into a law. After the most mature reflection he had come to the opinion that capital punishment might be safely abolished, and he would therefore vote for the second reading, if the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gilpin) called for a division upon his Motion.

MR. W. M. TORRENS said, he thought that the supporters of the principle of this Bill ought to feel thankful to the right hon. Gentleman for the speech he had just made. Surely they had a right to triumph in the adhesion of the right hon. Gentleman, whose long standing in that House and superior judgment upon all matters that came before it rendered the opinions he had just expressed extremely valuable to the advocates of the present Bill—opinions which he did not shrink from avowing, after his long experience of political life, upon the inexorable logic of facts.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 58; Noes 118: Majority 60.

AYES.

Anderson, G.
Armitstead, G.
Blake, J. A.
Bowring, E. A.
Brady, J.
Brewer, Dr.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Brown, A. H.
Candlish, J.
Carter, Mr. Ald.
Cowen, J.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Dalrymple, D.
Delahunty, J.
Dixon, G.
Downing, M'C.
Fawcett, H.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fletcher, I.
Fordyce, W. D.
Graham, W.
Gray, Sir J.
Hadfield, G.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Holms, J.
Illingworth, A.
Johnston, A.
Laslett, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leatham, E. A.
Lush, Dr.
Lusk, A.
Mackintosh, E. W.
M'Laren, D.
Maguire, J. F.
Melly, G.
Miall, E.
Morley, S.
Mundella, A. J.
Palmer, J. H.
Parker, C. S.
Philips, R. N.
Potter, E.
Reed, C.
Robertson, D.
Rylands, P.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Salt, T.
Shaw, R.
Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Smith, E.
Stacpoole, W.
Stapleton, J.
Tite, Sir W.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Wright, Colonel
Young, A. W.

TELLERS.

Gilpin, C.
Fowler, R. N.

NOES.

Adam, W. P.
Adderley, rt. hn. Sir C. B.
Akroyd, E.
Allen, W. S.
Amphlett, R. P.
Arkwright, A. P.
Assheton, R.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Ball, J. T.
Barrington, Viscount
Baxter, W. E.
Bolckow, H. W. F.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brodrick, hon. W.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Campbell, H.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Cartwright, F.
Cawley, C. E.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chambers, M.
Cholmeley, Sir M.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collins, T.
Corrance, F. S.
Crawford, R. W.
Cubitt, G.
Dalrymple, C.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Denison, E.
Dickinson, S. S.
Dimsdale, R.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Edwardes, hon. Col. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Enfield, Viscount
Erskine, Vice-Ad. J. E.
Ewing, A. O.
Eykyn, R.
Feilden, H. M.
Fellowes, E.
Figgins, J.
Finnie, W.
French, rt. hon. Col.
Garlies, Lord
Glyn, G. G.
Gore, J. R. O.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Grant, Colonel hon. J.
Gray, Lieut.-Colonel
Greaves, E.
Grieve, J. J.
Gurney, rt. hon. R.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Henley, Lord
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, A. S.
Hodgson, W. N.
Holford, R. S.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hoskyns, C. Wren-
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Laird, J.
Lambert, N. G.
Langton, W. H. P. G.
Lawrence, W.
Loch, G.
Lowther, W.
M'Lagan, P.
Maitland, Sir A. C. R. G.
Matheson, A.
Mellor, T. W.
Meyrick, T.
Milles, hon. G. W.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monk, C. J.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Neville-Grenville, R.
Nicol, J. D.
Noel, Hon. G. J.
Ogilvy, Sir J.
Otway, A. J.
Patten, rt. hon. Col. W.
Peel, A. W.
Phipps, C. P.
Powell, W.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Russell, A.
Scott, Sir W.
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Sidebottom, J.
Smith, W. H.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Stepney, Colonel
Sturt, Lt. Col. N.
Sykes, Col. W. H.
Talbot, J. G.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Tollemache, J.
Walker, Major G. G.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Welby, W. E.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Williams, W.
Wilmot, H.
Winterbotham, H. S. P.
Wise, H. C.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Young, G.

TELLERS.

Lewis, J. D.
Tipping, W.

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

GAME LAWS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[LORD ELCHO.]

(*Lord Elcho, Sir Graham Montgomery.*)

[BILL 36.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

LORD ELCHO, in rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that as, at this late period of the Session, it was hopeless to expect that it should pass into law during the present Session, he should conclude by withdrawing it. He wished, however, in the first place, to make a few observations upon the subject. Three Bills had been introduced into the House during the Session; the first, introduced by himself in the Session of 1867, had formed the basis of the legislation recommended by the Select Committee, to whom a similar Bill had been referred; the second, by the hon. Member for Linlithgow, whose Bill had also been referred during the same Session to a Select Committee, who had not adopted it as the basis of the legislation they proposed; and the third, by the hon. Member for the Wick Burghs, which rendered valid all agreements respecting game which tenants and their landlords might think fit to enter into. There was no hope of any one of these Bills becoming law; and seeing that to be the case, the hon. and learned Member for Wick (Mr. Loch) gave notice for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the subject. The principle of inquiry appeared to have been admitted on all hands. The only question seemed to have been as to the form the inquiry should take. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone) proposed, as an Amendment to the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Wick, that the inquiry should be by a Commission, and not by a Committee. He therefore hoped that the Government would not attempt legislation on the subject until there had been an inquiry. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Portsmouth, who was in the habit of speaking his mind in plain terms, had said, on a former occasion, that this Scotch Game question was one of the greatest impostures of the day. The question had been made a stalking-horse at Scotch elections. He did not pretend to say that there were not cases in Scotland of excessive game preservation; but he believed they were few. They could not legislate generally for occasional abuse in the agricultural districts. Such abuse was no reason why they should abolish the whole of the Game Laws where game was a most valuable description of property, and where it did no injury to tenants. He maintained that even in the rural districts the cases of over-preservation of game were few in number, and they certainly ought not to legislate without having all the facts before them. As regarded hares, he knew that in his own county there was only one hare now for ten that existed when he was a boy. Unquestionably there were one or two cases of great abuse of excessive preservation—of excessive sale of game —which had given a bad name to game preserving, and he admitted that a stop ought to be put to such an evil either by legislation or by public opinion; but what he asked for was an inquiry which should extend to England as well as to Scotland. He confessed, however, that he had not much confidence in the action of the Government in this matter, seeing what they had done in the cases of the Annuity Tax and the Law of Hypothec. It appeared — with respect to Scotch measures, at all events—that the Government were ready to vote for the second reading of Bills which they did not approve. He believed the reason of this to be a disinclination, on the part of the Government, to do anything which might be displeasing to any portion of their good Scotch majority. Only yesterday Scotch Members, in their appeal to the Government on the Parochial Schools Bill, said, in effect—" We supported you thick and thin during the debates on the Irish Church Bill; won't you, then, in return, do as much for us?" This question of the Game Laws had been made a hustings question in Scotland. It had been made a shibboleth at the elections; and when he observed the tone taken by hon. Members on this subject, he could not help thinking that their feelings must be that they had only to open their mouth wide enough, and the Government was sure to grant what they asked for without inquiry. He regretted that there should be any thought of agitation on this question without inquiry. He believed public opinion to be against the excessive preservation of game; and he believed that if the landlords would let their tenants shoot hares and rabbits they would still have as much game as they would care to shoot. This was a very wide question. He was prepared for a change in the law; but he was not prepared to go the length of the hon. Member for the Wick Burghs, and say that when one man had got something to sell, and another man wanted to buy it, the Legislature should step in and prevent that. He said, with regard to this question of game legislation, that in every country where there were no Game Laws there was a strict law of trespass, and nowhere was the trespass law more strict than it was in America. If the tenant was oppressed by his landlord with regard to game, he should be able readily to obtain redress. That was his broad view of this question. He hoped his learned Friend the Lord Advocate would not introduce a Bill on the subject, on behalf of the Government, until a Commission of Inquiry, both for England and Scotland, had ascertained the facts of the case, and had enabled them to legislate wisely and for the benefit of all concerned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Elcho.*)

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN wished to explain that his opposition to the Bill did not arise from any objection to the principle or to the Preamble, but solely from the inadequacy of the means proposed to effect the result aimed at. Were such a Bill to become law, professing to amend the Game Laws of Scotland, but leaving altogether untouched numerous and important points which could not be lost sight of in any satisfactory measure, he believed the farmers and the people of Scotland would feel that their wants and their wishes had been ignored by the Legislature, and that the time for considering and redressing their grievances had been indefinitely postponed.

MR. LOCH said, he regretted the manner in which this question had been dealt with by the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) and the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone); but there was a method in the bluntness of the hon. Member for Portsmouth, for it enabled him to prevent the inquiry which the Government had in view, and which would probably have elicited many facts useful for the purpose of legislation. That was the effect of his interposing a proposal for a Commission in lieu of a Committee. When the hon. Member had gained his point, he said not one word about either the one or the other, and at once threw up his Motion for a Commission. He (Mr. Loch) was glad to be able to believe that this was not a party question. He had reason to believe that there were Gentlemen on the other side of the House who were anxious to see a remedy applied to the present state of things; while, on the other hand, he was sorry to say there were Gentlemen on this side who, though they had been inexorable with regard to Irish curates, on the question of foxes and rabbits were strong Conservatives. It was with reluctance he had moved in this matter; but circumstances had given him an opportunity of observing the evils arising from the present state of the Game Laws in Scotland, and also of seeing how great were the advantages arising from a good feeling between landlord and tenant. When the meeting of Members was held on this question, the details of the noble Lord's Bill were not considered. Only that the noble Lord, on a former occasion, had referred to certain agricultural meetings, he should not have alluded to the fact that at those meetings the noble Lord's Bill was described as a "pretence" and a "sham," and as a Bill which was not intended to accomplish any good. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Linlithgowshire in his views on this subject; but no one could doubt that hon. Member's honesty of purpose, and his efforts were entitled to be spoken of with respect, as they had been at the meeting. He thought some of the clauses of the Bill of the hon. Member for Linlithgowshire so wide that they would encourage poaching. In his own Bill he proceeded on the principle that neither by common law nor by statute was there any property in game. The statutes having reference to game were, in fact, only a code of regulations with reference to the killing of wild animals. They were, therefore, as much within the ken of Parliament as were the laws which regulated public-houses. The grievance consisted in excessive preservation. His object had been to provide a remedy for that evil by giving landlords and tenants equal power to kill hares and rabbits, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary; but there was due provision in the Bill for the compensation of landlords on account of interference with existing contracts. This question, however, should be dealt with as one affecting the community at large, and hence he proposed to prevent such contracts from being entered into in future. The law of Scotland was opposed to a landowner's creating a nuisance on his estate, and no one could deny that an excessive congregation of hares and rabbits constituted a nuisance. The analogy of the law with regard to the truck system was also in point. The hon. Member then cited some old Scotch laws in support of his view.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he thought that the noble Lord (Lord Elcho), who had referred to several acts in his political life, had, in his conduct with reference to the subject of Reform, scarcely been so consistent himself as to be entitled to bring a charge of that nature against any other hon. Member. He (the Lord Advocate) begged to say that the Scotch Members who sat behind him were a more numerous phalanx than they ever were before, and they were as honest, as independent, and as perfectly ready to redeem their pledges as any other Members of that House. It was because they thought there was a grievance, and because they thought it was not an imposture, that so much time and trouble had been spent in the consideration of the subject. That was his view, and he believed it was the view entertained generally by the people of Scotland. Whether that grievance might be exaggerated or not was another matter; but he thought it was not fair, on the part of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire and other Scotch Members, to say that this question had been used for party purposes, and as a means of stirring up agitation on the hustings. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone) might be excused in the matter, as he and his constituents of Scotland were not of the one way of thinking. So much for consistency in general. The Government had carefully considered the proposal of issuing a Commission, as suggested by his noble Friend; but they did not think that that would be the best mode of adjusting the matter, because, in their opinion, there was already sufficient information to enable them to legislate, if legislation were found necessary. The whole subject would receive careful consideration during the Recess, with a view to legislation, if it was thought advisable to make any alteration in the law.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE denied that he had made any imputation upon his hon. Friend the Member for Wick. He had certainly stated that the way in which the Game question had been handled at the elections in Scotland was an injustice; but he had not the slightest intention of connecting with that statement his hon. Friend, whose father as well as he himself he had known for many years. His charge of profligacy had been made against the clause which proposed to sanction the departure from agreements which had been voluntarily entered into by those who proposed to break them. But the charge of profligacy was no new charge in the House of Commons, for it was no very great length of time since Lord Palmerston had said that none but a profligate Government could ever propose the disestablishment of the Irish Church. With regard to the general question, he wished to say that the Government came to a distinct understanding with them that the Committee was to be withdrawn, and that, before legislation took place, there should be an inquiry by a Royal Commission. ["No!"]

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Quite the reverse. The Government never said a single word pledging themselves to a Royal Commission.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE admitted the Government did not pledge themselves; but they had a majority in the House, and they were going to a division, when overtures were made to them that they should allow the matter to drop, on the understanding that the Government would legislate upon the question; but that, previous to legislation, a Royal Commission should issue to inquire into the subject. ["No, no!"] He appealed to the hon. Member for Berwickshire, to the noble Lord, and to hon. Members who were present on that occasion, to say whether what he had stated was not the fact?

MR. ROBERTSON: The Government agreed to legislate; but they did not agree to the appointment of a Royal Commission.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he would not detain the House any longer. He would only say, in conclusion, that he could not see the necessity for legislation on this subject.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

SANITARY ACT (1866) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary BRUCE, Bill to facilitate the borrowing Money in certain cases for the purpose of "The Sanitary Act, 1866," and the Acts amending the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary BRUCE and Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 244.]

~~~~~~

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 29th July, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Fisheries (Ireland) * (236).

Second Reading—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (217); Jamaica Loans * (204); Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks * (211); Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal * (195); Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. (209); Valuation of Property (Metropolis) * (229); Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * (232); Millbank Prison * (234), *postponed;* Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * (235).

Committee—Contagious Diseases * (221); Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment * (108-238).

Committee—Report—County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act (1868) Amendment * (173); Shipping Dues Exemption Act (1867) Amendment * (178); Cinque Ports Act Amendment * (216).

Third Reading—Bankruptcy (208); Prevention of Gaming (Scotland) * (206), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Ecclesiastical Courts (191).

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS BILL.

(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

(NO. 191.) BILL WITHDRAWN.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, the Select Committee had reported this Bill with Amendments; but the Session being now so far advanced, he felt it useless to proceed further with it. He should take the earliest opportunity next Session of re-introducing it.

Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—(No. 217.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that although it consisted of 126 clauses it was, in fact, a measure for consolidating the existing law. That being so, it would not be necessary to detain their Lordships by a minute statement of the details. As their Lordships were aware, the Privy Council was already invested with large powers with reference to the contagious and infectious diseases of animals, but many persons interested in agriculture desired special legislative provision for dealing with two wide-spread diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and sheep-pox. Authority was consequently given in the Bill to deal with these diseases in a stringent manner—especially with pleuro-pneumonia, which was highly infectious, and more certainly fatal. The principal new provisions of the Bill were those relating to the regulations for the importation of foreign cattle, the Government having felt it their duty, while preserving to the public the benefit of free trade in cattle and a free supply of food, to strengthen the powers intrusted to the Executive of so regulating the importation of foreign cattle as to prevent the introduction of diseases. The principle of the Bill was to give large discretionary powers to the Privy Council, so that their action might be varied according to the different circumstances of different countries. With regard to the supply of foreign cattle for the London market, it had been found necessary under the present system to draw a cordon round the metropolis, so that all beasts, whether foreign or domestic, which came within it, were prohibited from leaving it alive. This restriction, checking the movements of cattle, had operated very inconveniently to home breeders, and had been much complained of; and the Government had endeavoured to remove it without running the risk of introducing into this country diseases brought by foreign cattle. Power was given to the City of London to provide a market to which all cattle coming
~~~~~~

from suspected countries would be sent, none being permitted to be taken alive beyond a certain circuit. This market would have to be constructed before the end of 1872. He had no doubt the City of London would carry out the arrangement; but, in case of its default, that part of the Metropolitan Market Act which gave it a monopoly against all other persons within seven miles of a certain point would be abolished, so that other parties would be able to step in and provide what was needed. The new market would be subject to the approval of the Privy Council, and the cordon would then be removed. He believed that the operations of home breeders would thus be facilitated, while guarding against danger from foreign animals.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL said, he was glad to find that in this Bill protection was provided against the frightful and needless suffering undergone by cattle during the transit, and at the port of landing; and he was deeply grateful to the Government for having taken into consideration the evils they endured: but he would venture to suggest that the 64th and 76th clauses should be carried a little further. Their Lordships would have seen in *The Times* of that morning a letter on this subject from Professor Moffett, of the Queen's College, Galway. He had previously received a manuscript copy of the letter, and should have read it to the House, had it not already obtained full publicity. It had been hoped that conveyance by railway would considerably mitigate the sufferings formerly undergone; but no one could have been at a railway station, and seen the crowded cattle trucks full of beasts frantic with thirst and crowding, without being struck with horror at their sufferings. It was therefore with great satisfaction that he saw some provision made to remedy this dreadful evil. The 64th clause provided that animals should not be more than thirty hours in the trucks without being supplied with food and water; and evidence had been offered that they could fast twenty-four hours. This might be the case under the ordinary conditions; but when crowded in a truck, and exposed to every kind of terror, thirty hours were much too long a time, and he hoped that, in Committee, the Government would consent to reduce the number of hours to twelve. The 76th clause empowered the Privy Council to enforce that food and water should be supplied to animals, upon their being landed at our ports from a foreign country; but he thought that the Government might carry this matter further, and insist on food and water being supplied to them during the voyage. Nothing but the greed and rapacity of those engaged in the cattle trade prevented this being done; and it might easily be accomplished by providing that an inspector should be attached as supercargo to vessels engaged in the transport of cattle. But he thought they should be also protected from unnecessary suffering in conveyance by railway. It was true that persons having animals carried in a cruel way were liable to punishment; but there was a difficulty in enforcing the law. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of which he was a Vice President, had successfully prosecuted a dealer who, at his own risk, hired a railway truck and forced six animals into it; but there should be some general order, enabling railway companies to prevent over-crowding, on on the part of rapacious persons. He could assure their Lordships that the sufferings of cattle formed a subject of grave consideration among a great many reflecting persons, and that any legislation which would tend to alleviate them would be hailed as an honour to the country.

Lord COLONSAY rose to point out a difficulty which might arise in Scotland from the use of the term "local authority," as regarded counties; and objected to the option given to the Commissioners of Supply, as to whether the rate should be borne by the landlords or should be shared between them and their tenants. This would be invidious; and it would be better for Parliament to decide the point, the usual custom being that rates were divided equally between the landlord and the tenant.

Lord EGERTON of TATTON was glad the Government had taken steps to guard against other diseases besides cattle plague.

The Earl of ROMNEY referred to the great and unnecessary suffering caused by thirst, and expressed approval of the limitation suggested by the right rev. Prelate.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON, in reply, said he should be happy to consider the Amendments of the right rev. Prelate. Both aspects of the case should be taken into account, for the untrucking of animals to supply them with food and water was attended with suffering. He feared that the points raised by the noble and learned Lord, as to Scotland, could not be dealt with consistently with the privileges of the other House.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

BANKRUPTCY BILL—(No. 207-8.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THIRD READING.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD ROMILLY said, that before the Bill was read the third time he desired to point out that, as the Bill now stood, a person who drew a bill payable at any future day and who thereupon sold all his property and absconded from the country before the Bill became due, could not henceforth be made bankrupt until after the bill had arrived at maturity, and after all the property had been abstracted. This was an entire change in the law as it now existed, and one which would give rise to great frauds. The Select Committee, however, having been divided on this point, he should not revive it. He believed it also to be a great mistake to make the amount of dividend the criterion of a bankrupt's honesty. The effect of it was to induce persons to obtain a large amount of goods on the eve of bankruptcy, which they knew they could not pay for, in order to raise the dividend to 10*s.* in the pound, and he feared this would give rise to frauds which the penal clauses would not sufficiently check. The valuation of the assets—if this principle were adopted—ought to be made at the time of the adjudication. This would be less objectionable, and the bankrupt ought not to be punished on account of difficulty or neglect in realizing those assets, being a matter over which he had no control.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR denied that the Bill made the dividend the sole criterion. A bankrupt's liability would not continue if the failure to pay 10*s.* in the pound arose from faulty collection of the assets; and it would cease if the creditors expressed an opinion that the bankruptcy was due to unavoidable misfortune.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill *passed* and sent to the Commons.

PRESENTATION OF BENEFICES BELONGING TO ROMAN CATHOLICS, &c., BILL—(No. 209.)

(*The Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

SECOND READING.

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL said, that his most rev. Friend (the Archbishop of Canterbury), who was unavoidably absent, had requested him to move the second reading of this Bill. The object was to repeal a clause in an Act of William and Mary, which provided that clergymen presented to benefices by the Universities on account of the patrons being Roman Catholics should forfeit such livings if they failed to reside during the whole year, with the exception of sixty days. The general Act of 1 & 2 *Vict.*, c. 106, allowed other incumbents three months' absence, the penalty of exceeding it being simply ecclesiastical censure, and this Bill proposed to bring the former class under the same rule.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.*)

LORD CAMOYS said, he had expected, considering the liberality of sentiment of the most rev. Prelate, that the object of the Bill was to repeal the disqualification under which Roman Catholic patrons alone laboured. Surely, there could be no greater danger to the Church of England from Roman Catholic patrons than from Jews and Dissenters, every presentation being subject to the license of the Bishop? Roman Catholics were now obliged to sell the next presentation; but, if the incumbent died before this was done, one of the Universities presented; but such patronage might be relinquished without much loss, there being but a small number of livings, held by the Duke of Norfolk, himself, and other Roman Catholic Peers.

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL said, he could hardly undertake the responsibility of stating what the opinion of his most rev. Friend the Archbishop of Canterbury was on the subject mentioned by the noble Lord. For his own part, he had no objection to say that there was, in his opinion, a considerable amount of inconvenience in connection with the patronage as exercised by the Universities.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Commitee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 29*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —Civil Service Estimates.

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—East India Loan; Harbour of Galle Loan.

Ordered—First Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance* [245]; Offices Abolition* [246]; Dividends on Public Stocks* [247].

First Reading — Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* [248].

Second Reading—Basses Lights (Ceylon)* [224]; Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* [227]; Accounts, &c. Presentation* [240]; Charity Commissioners* [239].

Committee — Report — Public Works (Ireland)* [202]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment* [55]; Nitro Glycerine (*re-comm.*)* [235]; Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* [236]; Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul)* [237]; Criminal Lunatics* [172]; Clerk of Assize* [203]; Militia (Ireland)* [228]; New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment* [225]; Seamen's Clothing* [242]; Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* [87].

Considered as amended — Telegraph [233]; Seeds Adulteration* [222]; Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham)* [210]; Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* [87].

Third Reading—Telegraph [233]; Seeds Adulteration* [222], and *passed.*

POOR LAWS—KEIGHLEY UNION.

QUESTION.

Mr. H. B. SAMUELSON said, he wished to ask the President of the Poor Law Board, Whether his attention has been called to a Letter signed J. A. Busfield, which appeared in the "Times" newspaper of 22nd July, to the effect that an order had been made by the Guardians of the Keighley Union, that neither food nor the opportunity of obtaining food by work shall be provided for the inmates of the casual ward in that Union; and, whether that statement is true; whether the same practice prevails in other Unions; and, if so, whether the practice does not require immediate prohibition?

Mr. GOSCHEN said, in reply, that the statement in Mr. Busfield's letter was not perfectly accurate, and the explanation he had received from the guardians did not fully agree with it. The real order was as follows:—

> "The Committee leave it optional for vagrants to leave the workhouse in a morning without breakfast, or to stay until noon and pick oakum in return for their breakfast."

However, for six months, owing to the reluctance of the vagrants to perform the task of work, there had occurred no case of vagrants performing the work and receiving breakfast, and that circumstance had given rise to the impression that breakfast was under no circumstances supplied. The general practice in workhouses was to enforce work, and then give breakfast, and he thought that the custom at Keighley Union of making both the work and the breakfast optional was not one to be commended, though it was not so barbarous as might have been inferred from the statement which had been published.

NAVY—FRESH WATER FOR THE FLEET.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether any regulations have been issued restricting the quantity of fresh water to be used at sea, with a view to economy of fuel for distillation? He put the question in consequence of seeing it stated that the crew of one of Her Majesty's ships now sailing round the world had suffered from want of fresh water.

Mr. CHILDERS: Sir, when I first saw my hon. and gallant Friend's Notice on the Paper I imagined that he was about to suggest a new field for economy, which I confess I should never have thought of. But he now states that he refers to a letter in a newspaper—which I regret should have been written by an officer in the service—as to the allowance of water in the flying squadron, and I have only to say that no regulation on this subject has been made by the present Board of Admiralty. The only reference to the supply of fresh water which I can find is a suggestion that, in the Mediterranean, ships should fill up at certain ports where they often call.

SCOTCH AND IRISH FISHERIES.

QUESTION.

MR. STACPOOLE said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, How many Government steam vessels, sailing vessels (exclusive of Revenue Cutters), and ships boats' crews have been employed, and for how long during the past twelve months, for the supervision and protection of the Scotch Fisheries; and, to ask the same question in reference to the Irish Fisheries?

MR. CHILDERS said, in reply, that last year two vessels were employed, one upon the East Coast of Scotland, and the other upon the West Coast, with the small vessels attached to them, for the protection of the Scotch fisheries; but this year one of these had been reported as not being necessary, and one vessel, with the small vessels attached, would be employed. On the Irish coast there was a vessel attached to each of the three stationary ships which were available for the protection of Irish Fisheries. Some months ago he had placed himself in communication with his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the result of which had been that when vessels were required for the protection of fisheries they would only be sent upon a requisition from the Secretary of State. He did not think that the Navy was the proper body to carry on the ordinary police protection of our in-shore waters.

THE CORONATION OATH—QUESTION.

MR. WHITE said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether it be the fact that by reason of the late repeal of the Legislative Union of the Churches of England and Ireland, the statutory form of the Coronation Oath, so far as it related to the United Church of England and Ireland is also virtually repealed; and, if so, whether it is intended to submit to Parliament any measure whereby a new form of Oath may be substituted for the same?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, I have to remind my hon. Friend that the words of the Oath taken by Her Majesty on her Coronation are not words prescribed by any Act of Parliament. The only two Acts of Parliament whereby the form of Oath has been prescribed are these—the 1st *William and Mary*, s. 1, c. 6, the words of which are—

> "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the due profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed religion established by the Law; and will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this Realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by Law do, or shall, appertain and belong to them?"

That is the form of words prescribed by the 1st *William and Mary*. Then follows a statute of the 5th *Anne*, upon the union between England and Scotland. And that Act, after making provision that that Union shall not affect the Established Church of England, proceeds to say—

> "Every King and Queen succeeding shall take and subscribe an Oath"—

Observe, not prescribing the particular form, the words of the statute being in general terms—

> "To maintain and preserve inviolate the said settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by Law established, within the kingdoms of England and Ireland, the Principality of Wales, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and the territories thereunto belonging."

That is the last statute which has prescribed any form of Oath. Perhaps, I am not correct in saying that this prescribes a form of Oath. It only indicates the general character of the Oath to be taken. The Act of Union made no mention of the Coronation Oath, but it united the two Churches of England and Ireland. Upon the accession of George IV. to the Throne it became a matter of serious consideration whether some alteration of the Oath would not be desirable in order to meet the altered circumstances produced by the Union. It was suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury that some change should be made. The matter was considered by Lord Eldon, who was then Lord Chancellor, and by the Law Officers of the Crown, one of whom was Lord Lyndhurst, and it was agreed by them that it was in the power of the Privy Council to change the words of the Oath, and to adapt it to the altered circumstances of the case; and, accordingly, a change in the form of the Oath was then made by order of the Privy Council, adapting the Oath to the union of the two Churches. Upon the accession of Her Majesty the question of the Coronation Oath was again considered, and the words which constitute the present Oath, and which were taken by the Queen, were then settled by the Privy Council. I believe the persons who settled the form of the Oath were Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister; Lord Cottenham, the Lord Chancellor; Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Russell; and I rather think the Law Officers of the Crown, Lord Campbell and Lord Cranworth (then Sir John Rolfe) were consulted. It was under the Order of the Privy Council at that time, that the words of the Oath taken by Her Majesty were settled, and those words were these—

> "Will you maintain and preserve inviolately the settlement of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, and government thereof, as by Law established within England and Ireland, and the territories thereunto belonging?"

Therefore, I say, in answer to my hon. Friend, that if the Privy Council had the power to change the form of the Oath, so as to adapt it to the altered circumstances produced by the union of the two Churches, the Privy Council must have the same power of altering it now, so as to adapt it to the new state of things produced by the separation of the Churches; and, if that it be so, no Act of Parliament will be necessary; and I believe it is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to bring in any Act.

ARMY—MONCRIEFF GUN CARRIAGES.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN BEAUMONT said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If the mode of mounting the guns at the Coalhouse Fort is decided; and, if so, whether they are to be mounted behind shields or on Moncrieff gun carriages?

MR. CARDWELL said, in reply, that the armament of the Coalhouse Fort had not yet been decided on; but he supposed the Question had respect to the assumption—which he had no doubt would turn out to be well-founded—that the Moncrieff carriages could be applied as successfully to guns of twelve or eighteen tons, as they had been already to the smaller guns.

ARMY—CASE OF DR. MACLOUGHLIN.

QUESTION.

MR. BRADY said, he wished to ask, Why Dr. Macloughlin has not been restored to his position in the Army, in accordance with the several recommendations of the Commander-in-Chief?

CAPTAIN VIVIAN replied that, in the very voluminous correspondence which existed on this subject in the War Department, and which chiefly consisted of letters from that gentleman, there was no trace of his ever having been recommended to be reinstated in the service. The case had been considered by various Commanders-in-Chief and Secretaries of State for War—by the Duke of York, Lord Hill, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Palmerston, Lord Panmure, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and General Peel, all of whom had concurred in opinion that he should not be reinstated.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES' ACTS.

QUESTION.

MR. W. LOWTHER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a draft of Bill to consolidate, with Amendments, the Acts relating to Friendly Societies; whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to legislate on the question of Friendly Societies; whether Her Majesty's Government intend to adopt any of the suggestions contained in that draft of Bill; and, whether they will recommend issuing a Royal Commission upon the subject?

MR. BRUCE: Sir, I do not think the suggestions to which the hon. Gentleman refers are such as the Government could adopt. With respect to the Question whether it is the intention of the Government to legislate on the subject, I beg to state that they have at this moment under consideration the point whether they should proceed to amend the law by way of legislation, or whether they should institute a preliminary inquiry by way of Royal Commission.

MEXICAN BONDHOLDERS.—QUESTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in the event of the Mexican Bondholders' Committee sending out forthwith a special agent to the Mexican Government, with a view to the conclusion of some satisfactory arrangement of the claims now pending between that Government and British subjects, any aid of an official character could be given by Her Majesty's Government?

MR. OTWAY: Sir, the hon. Gentleman is of course aware that our diplomatic relations with Mexico have been for some time past interrupted, in consequence of proceedings of the Mexican Government, which have been alluded to more than once in this House. We are unable, therefore, to give any official aid to the agent of whom the hon. Member speaks. Her Majesty's Government is well aware of the importance of the claims of British subjects on the Mexican Government, both in regard to their pecuniary amount and the serious questions involved in them, and we should hear with much pleasure that satisfactory arrangements of these claims had been made.

NAVY—ADMIRALTY CONTRACTORS.
QUESTION.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will lay upon the Table of the House Return of the Contracts in force at the Admiralty on the 1st day of December 1868, and the names of the Contractors; of the penalties at that date falling due upon any then existing Contracts, and of the names of the parties so contracting whose character is considered by him to be unsatisfactory; and, of the names of the firms or others excepted now from Government Tenders, and of the causes for such exclusion?

MR. BAXTER: Sir, a Return of formal contracts, even if it were desirable to furnish it, would not give the hon. and gallant Gentleman the information which he wishes, inasmuch as many persons have transacted business with the Admiralty who are not contractors; and there is certainly no intention of laying on the table of this House the names of individuals or firms with whom, as responsible Financial Secretary, I decline to have commercial relations of any kind.

SIR JOHN HAY: I beg, Sir, to give notice that I shall renew the inquiry early next Session.

PARLIAMENT—REPORTERS' GALLERY.
QUESTION.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, If his attention has been called to the ill-ventilated and otherwise insufficient accommodation provided for the gentlemen who represent the Public Press in this House, which renders the discharge of their duties dangerous to health; and whether he will take means during the Recess to provide a waiting room, refreshment room, and lavatories suitable for educated gentlemen?

MR. LAYARD, in reply, said, he was sorry to say he could confirm the expressions made use of in the Question of the hon. Gentleman. He had himself examined the accommodation provided for those who reported their proceedings, and he must confess that nothing could be worse, whether as regarded ventilation or the accommodation necessary to carry on their duties, and other arrangements which gentlemen in their position had a right to require from the House. But he was at a loss to know how to give that accommodation. The thing, he feared, was impossible. He thought he saw his way to give increased ventilation, and if he could give increased room he would be very glad to do so. He might take that opportunity of stating to the House that he had reason to believe the Lords would agree to the suggestions that had been made by some Members of that House with regard to the dining room, and before the close of the Session he hoped to be able to submit a proposition which the Lords had made on the subject, and to take the opinion of the House upon it.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY—OFFICERS OF THE ARMY IN JAPAN.—OBSERVATIONS.

Colonel NORTH, in rising to bring under the consideration of the House the present position of the Officers of the Army stationed in Japan as to pay and allowances; and to ask, upon what grounds the Lords of the Treasury have refused to carry out the recommendations of the Secretary for War and of His Royal Highness the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, that the rates allowed for Japan should be assimilated to those granted in China, said, that as the question did not involve either religion or politics, he hoped to receive the support of all parties. The officers originally received the same pay and allowances as those in China, but a short time ago a deduction of 25 per cent was made from the allowances granted to the officers stationed in Japan, on the ground of certain advantages enjoyed by them, which had, however, all disappeared, while the cost of living there remained as high as in China. The first to suffer were the officers of the second battalion of the 9th Regiment, who in October, 1867, in a memorandum which was laid before Major General Guy, and by him transmitted to the Military Secretary of the Horse Guards, represented that the necessary expenses to which officers serving in Japan were subjected far exceeded even those which prevailed in China. Notwithstanding this, they had been subjected to a reduction of one-fourth of the allowances granted in China, so that they had to meet largely increased and increasing expenditure upon reduced allowances. That letter led to a request from the War Office to Major General Brunker, who had succeeded General Guy in command, to obtain trustworthy evidence of the cost of living in China and Japan respectively. Major General Brunker, in a letter dated "Head Quarters, Hong Kong," stated that he had assembled boards of officers in both countries, and that the Hong Kong Board reported that the cost of living at that station had increased from 25 to 30 per cent during the last ten years. The report of the Yokohama Board showed that the salaries of the *employés* of the banking and mercantile houses varied from £300 to £500 per annum, exclusive of board, lodging, and medical attendance, which income they received also while on leave in England one year in six, their passage money being also paid out and home. On the 17th of June, 1868, Major General Brunker made his report to the Horse Guards. It had been stated that the allowances granted to the officers in Hong Kong and China were necessary, because it was impossible for them to do their duty without the use of "chairs," and that the officers in Japan did not require "chairs," and were, therefore, not put to that expense. The winter, however, at Yokohama was long and very severe, and the price of coal was enormous, amounting sometimes to $22 a ton. The officers at Yokohama were also obliged to pay for the water they used. Upon the arrival home of the 9th Regiment, at the half-yearly inspection, held at Dublin on the 6th of October, 1868, a respectful remonstrance was made to General M'Murdo, who was then the general in command, against the reduction of 25 per cent from the China scale of allowances enforced against the officers while serving in Japan. The officers stated that the Commission at Hong Kong had sent in its report, but that no reply had yet been received to their representations. On the 18th of November, 1868, a letter was received from Secretary Sir John Pakington, stating that he had applied to the Lords of the Treasury for their consent to allow the rates allowed for Japan to be assimilated to those granted in China. He (Colonel North) begged now to refer to a long correspondence which took place some years ago between the War Office under different Secretaries at War and the Treasury on the subject of the great expense incurred by the officers of the Queen's Regiments stationed in China. On the 22nd of March, 1859, General Peel, the then Secretary at War, pressed, in the strongest manner, that the Indian allowances should be granted to officers of the British Army in China, and on the 24th of March that request was granted. On the 12th of April, 1861, Mr. Herbert expressed his opinion that the Indian allowances to those troops should be continued, and on the 7th of May that proposal was approved by the Treasury, who, however, suggested that the Indian troops should be removed from Hong Kong at the earliest opportunity. Sir George Lewis also pressed the Treasury to continue the Indian allowance, but at length the pressure from the Treasury was so great that the Indian troops were withdrawn, and with them the Indian allowances were discontinued to the Queen's troops. The result of the removal of the Indian troops from that station had been most disastrous to the European troops, who had then to perform escort and night duties themselves, hundreds of men in each battalion dying or being rendered incapable of performing their duty in consequence. On the 7th of March, 1862, the War Office forwarded the commuted allowance recommended by a Committee, of which the Treasury expressed their approval in April of that year, but was again revised. On the 4th of September, 1862, Sir George Lewis proposed that the Indian rate then in force should be continued as long as the exceptional high prices of provisions and lodging should continue, and on the 17th of September it was decided that the Indian allowances should be continued to the end of the financial year. In December, 1862, the Secretary for War stated that he was unable to recommend any reduction in the allowances of the British troops serving in China. On the 12th of July, 1863, the Treasury announced that they did not object to continuing those allowances for another year. A number of extracts from letters from Hong Kong and Yokohama shewed the inconvenience and expense to which officers and men stationed at the latter place were put. He merely asked that the regiment stationed at Yokohama should receive the same rate of pay as that stationed at Hong Kong. The necessaries of life at the former place were at a most exorbitant price, and the troops stationed there merely asked to be placed on the same footing on which they stood before the 30th of June, 1866, when their pay was equal to that of the troops at Hong Kong, it being at present about one-fourth less.

MR. STANSFELD said, the speech of his hon. and gallant Friend was considerably wider than the terms of the Notice which he had placed upon the Paper, and it was to this only that he should attempt to offer a reply. The arrangement of which his hon. and gallant Friend complained was entered into between the War Office and the Treasury in the spring of 1866. By that arrangement the allowances on the China station, as fixed in 1865, were raised, and it formed part of the proposals which led to that arrangement that the increased allowance in China could be fairly met by allowing only three-fourths of such increased allowance to the officers stationed in Japan. His hon. and gallant Friend had spoken at considerable length, and with very natural feeling of the sufferings to which British regiments at Hong Kong were exposed by reason of the climate. [Colonel NORTH observed that it was partly owing to their having to perform the duty which was originally performed for them by the native troops.] But it was precisely because of the dangers arising from the climate in China that the pay and allowances had been fixed at the generous and liberal scale at which they now stood. It was almost entirely because the climate of Japan was temperate, and not specially dangerous to Europeans, that the authorities at the War Office in 1866 believed that the allowance in Japan might be commuted to three-fourths of that in China. His hon. and gallant Friend inquired why the Treasury, in 1868, had refused to sanction the proposal which then came from the War Office to assimilate the allowances in Japan to those which had been sanctioned in China. That decision, which was given by the late, not by the present Treasury Board, was given on the ground that the allowances both in China and Japan had been very recently settled, after considerable interdepartmental discussion and inquiry, both in the War Office and upon the stations, and that no sufficient cause had been shown or assigned in the communications from the War Office for assimilating the allowances in Japan to those sanctioned on the China station. His right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War having enabled him to read, not only the interdepartmental correspondence, but all the minutes of the War Office itself, and the figures bearing upon the question, he thought it only candid and fair to say, as far as his own opinion was concerned, that upon the information communicated to the late Treasury Board, or now in the possession of the Secretary of State for War, no sufficient ground had been shown for assimilating these allowances. Bearing in mind the difference in point of climate between the two stations and all the other circumstances, he was very much disposed to think that if the allowances in Japan were raised, the next thing would be a demand for a further increase in China.

COLONEL NORTH reminded his hon. Friend that when the arrangement was in contemplation, in 1866, a rate of exchange existed in Japan which gave to the officers there an advantage equal to 25 per cent.

MAJOR GENERAL SIR PERCY HERBERT observed that an injustice done in one part of the globe was not remedied by an injustice done in another. A gross injustice had been done to English officers in China by calling upon them to serve at a lower rate than officers sent from India. The subject of the pay and allowances to troops in China had been considered by the Committee of which he was a member, and of which Lord Salisbury was Chairman, and an Amendment which he (Sir Percy Herbert) moved to the Report, to the effect that the troops employed in China should be placed as nearly as might be upon the same footing as those employed in the East Indies, was only rejected by the casting vote of the Chairman. Under these circumstances, the recommendation now made by his hon. and gallant Friend was, he thought, worthy of attention. It was most undesirable that troops serving upon the same station should be in the receipt of different rates of pay and allowances, and the suggestion that Japan was not more uncomfortable than some of the stations in India was a very poor ground for refusing to do justice to officers on these Japanese stations. He begged to draw the attention of the Secretary of State for War to this fact. The number of troops quartered in Japan was very small, and he believed that discovering the exact time for which this 25 per cent was to be deducted in the case of troops sent from China to Japan, and restored in the case of troops sent from Japan to China, both being portions of the same command, caused as much trouble and clerical work at the War Office as would exhaust a considerable portion of the saving effected by this miserable economy.

COLONEL NORTH gave notice that when the House met again he should take the earliest opportunity of moving an Address to the Crown upon this subject

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, it would be well if the authorities who had to decide questions of this kind were themselves to visit the colonies. In this case, as he understood, in consequence of a dispute as to pay and allowances, some native Indian troops, who alone could do duty in a state of health in the Chinese climate, had been withdrawn from the station. The duty thus devolved upon the European troops, and entailed upon them such lamentable suffering that in eight and a-half months 193 died or were invalided in one battalion, and in four and a-half months 259 died or were invalided in another. The reason why all these men died or were invalided was simply that the Indian regiments, who could perform sentry and other duties in that climate without risk to health, had been withdrawn to save money to Her Majesty's Treasury. As to Japan, although it had a temperate climate, it must be remembered that there was a very long winter, and the officers were obliged to keep up expensive fires. Coals often cost as much as $22 a ton, and of wood there was almost none; officers, therefore, were obliged to clothe themselves much more warmly than they would otherwise do. The pay which they received was insufficient for these purposes. Besides, the cost of fuel and clothing, house rent, and all the necessaries of life, were extremely dear. The only advantage an officer had in going to Japan was that he went from an exceedingly bad climate to one somewhat better.

MR. CARDWELL said, he wished to point out the extreme importance in discussions of this kind of confining themselves as much as possible to the point really brought before the House. His hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel North) gave notice of a Motion, the object of which was to call attention to the inequality of the allowances in China and Japan, for the purpose of having them assimilated; but the larger portion of his speech turned upon the inadequacy of the allowances to troops in Hong Kong, as compared with those given in India. The inference which he drew from this was, that in dealing with the pay and allowances at any one station they were only dealing with one portion of a very large and complicated question, and the moment that the House of Commons decided to grant an increase at any one point they must expect a fresh proposal for increase elsewhere, based upon the success of the previous application. Dr. Murray's report pointed out that Hong Kong was a peculiar station, differing from all other stations, and requiring special allowances and indulgences not needed elsewhere. The moment therefore that an increase was granted at Japan a further application based upon Dr. Murray's report, might be expected from Hong Kong. The matter, however, was never officially dealt with by the present Government at all, but was decided before they came into Office. The Treasury had decided that the Indian allowance should continue so long as the Indian regiments remained; but they insisted that the Indian regiments should be withdrawn as speedily as possible, and they were withdrawn. It was afterwards determined to return a portion of the Indian force to Hong Kong, and an Indian regiment was sent there, but the Indian allowances were not re-established. The scales of allowance were the result of a correspondence that had taken place in 1866, between the War Office and the Treasury. In the more recent correspondence which had been laid before the House on the Motion of the hon. Member for Oxfordshire the War Office proposed to equalize the allowance to Japan with the allowance to China, but the Treasury, for the reasons which had been set forth, declined to do so. The ground on which a larger scale was allowed in Japan was not a difference of prices, but the existence of circumstances which were detailed by Dr. Murray. For instance, in Hong Kong the climate rendered it necessary that coolies should be employed to carry chairs for the use of the officers. The difference of climate caused a different rate of expenditure.

COLONEL NORTH said, it was proposed that a corps should be established for the Hong Kong service, the men to be enlisted in the Straits and officered by the Ceylon Rifle Corps.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BRUCE appealed to the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) and the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Charley) to postpone the Motions of which they had given notice. He said the hon. Member for Dudley would have an opportunity to-morrow of bringing forward his Notice on the subject of the conduct of Assistant Judge Huggins of Sierra Leone, and the Question of the hon. Member for Salford, with reference to the Coronation Oath, had been answered already in a reply given by the Attorney General to the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. White). It was very important that the House should at once go into Supply, with a view to all the Votes being got through that evening.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN expressed his readiness to yield to the request of the right hon. Gentleman, but hoped that the course he now took would be considered when the Question came before the House again.

MR. CHARLEY said, he did not think his Question had been answered by the Attorney General in his reply to the hon. Member for Brighton; he would not detain the House more than a few minutes with his Question.

CORONATION OATH.
QUESTION.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. CHARLEY rose to call the attention of the House to the subject of the Coronation Oath; and to ask a Question in relation thereto, which the Attorney General had really not answered. The answer which the hon. and learned Gentleman had already given was only to the effect that it was not necessary to pass an Act of Parliament to alter the Coronation Oath, as that might be done by the Privy Council. What he (Mr. Charley) wanted to ask for was some authoritative declaration of the meaning of the Coronation Oath. The Legislature, in removing a sentimental grievance from the minds of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, had created another in the minds of the Protestants of Ireland. The Royal Assent to the Irish Church Bill had given a great shock to the consciences and loyalty of the Irish Protestants. They believed that the Coronation Oath would place an insuperable barrier in the way of the success of the Prime Minister's policy with regard to the Irish Church, and he was not ashamed to say that he himself had held that view, when he held it in common with such statesmen as Lord Derby and Lord Redesdale. The sanctions of the Coronation Oath were legal, moral, and religious. Parliament might relieve the Sovereign from the legal obligation, and public opinion from the moral obligation; but he had held that the religious obligation was still binding upon the conscience of the Sovereign; and that was certainly the view held by Lord Derby when he called upon the House of Lords to stand between the Sovereign and her conscience. Other views had been expressed to the effect that the Coronation Oath only bound the conscience of the Sovereign in her executive, and not in her legislative capacity, and that the Legislature could release Her Majesty's conscience from the obligation of the Oath with regard to such a measure as the Irish Church Bill. The question he wished to ask was, whether the Government were prepared to introduce a short Bill this Session, declaring the true meaning of the Coronation Oath? In the next Parliament, if not in this, there would no doubt be a fierce attack made upon the Church of England, and it was important that English Churchmen should know what they had to rely upon. They had relied upon the Coronation Oath and upon the House of Lords, but both had proved broken reeds, and had pierced the hands that had leant upon them. It was important that they should know what were and what were not the bulwarks of the Constitution.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he hoped the hon. Member would not suppose him guilty of any disrespect if he declined to enter into a discussion of the Coronation Oath. If there was any subject which had been thoroughly discussed and expounded in discussion it was the Coronation Oath. It had been discussed many times, both in that and the other House of Parliament. He believed that the result of the discussion to which he referred was to leave a very clear impression on the minds of most persons that the Coronation Oath bound the Sovereign in an executive and not in a legislative capacity. It bound the Sovereign to maintain the laws till they were altered by the three Estates of the Realm; but it did not bind her to withhold her Assent from Bills sent to her by the two other Estates of the Realm. There being no difficulty about the construction of the Coronation Oath, he answered the Question by saying simply that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce this Session any Bill for the purpose of explaining that Oath.

MR. CHARLEY: Is it their intention to introduce such a Bill next Session?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I cannot say what will be done next Session.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he thought the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Charley) had no reason to be alarmed about the position of the Church of England because an act of justice had been done to Ireland by the passing of the Irish Church Bill. The Church of England stood secure on its own basis, and he thought there was not the slightest ground for the apprehensions entertained by the hon. Gentleman.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £27,835, to complete the sum for Law Charges.

(2.) £116,973, to complete the sum for Criminal Prosecutions, Sheriffs' Expenses, &c.

(3.) £45,242, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts.

(4.) £325,575, to complete the sum for County Courts.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK complained of the large amount allowed to the County Court Judges for travelling expenses. The amount under this head was £14,600, which would give about £240 in the shape of travelling expenses to each of the sixty Judges.

MR. GOLDNEY said, he had heard it stated that this item would allow every Judge to travel 30,000 miles a year at first-class fares.

MR. AYRTON said, as hon. Members were aware, some of the Courts were held at some considerable distance from the houses of the Judges. Expenses, however, were only allowed to Judges for the travelling which was necessary within their own circuits. The amounts had been fixed after careful consideration, and showed no change upon those of last year.

MR. MUNTZ desired to know the reason why the item of £6,735 under the head of "incidental expenses" had increased? It was difficult to understand the increase, because it was impossible to tell what they would be beforehand.

Mr. AYRTON replied, that a rough estimate had been made of what the probable expense in the case of each court would be; but the Committee might rest satisfied that no demand would be paid until it had been narrowly scrutinized, and shown to be justifiable.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £61,733, to complete the sum for Probate Courts.

Mr. MUNTZ again referred to the increase of the "incidental expenses" under this head.

Mr. GOLDNEY desired to know the meaning of the charge for "special allowances" in the case of the district registries?

Colonel FRENCH said, he believed that a good deal could be done in the way of reducing the expenses under this class; and he expressed a hope that Her Majesty's Government would see whether it might not be advisable to change the method under which officers of these courts were appointed—to throw them open by competition to men of ability, instead of allowing the appointments to remain in the hands of the Judges.

Mr. AYRTON said, that steps were being taken to enable Her Majesty's Government to review the salaries and emoluments of the officers of those courts as each of the appointments became vacant; but Parliament had always thought it desirable that the appointments themselves should be in the hands of the Judges. The "special allowances" referred to by the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney) were allowances that were made in consequence of the increase of district business, the salaries and emoluments originally fixed having remained unaltered.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £8,870, to complete the sum for Admiralty Court Registry.

(7.) £3,490, to complete the sum for Land Registry Office.

Mr. MUNTZ drew attention to the sums paid to the assistant registrars, and expressed a hope that as the offices became vacant they would not be filled up.

Mr. Alderman LUSK asked what had become of the Middlesex Registry Court?

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he wished to know what progress had been made in the scheme of land registry?

Mr. AYRTON said, the progress was necessarily measured by the fees received, and these for the last year amounted to only £250. [An hon. Member: Paid by one company.] This land registry was originally intended to carry out a great design—namely, to give everybody an indefeasible title to his estate, but the public did not appear to appreciate the offer. It was necessary to have responsible and highly-paid officers, almost in the position of Judges, who would undertake the duty of declaring that a man had an indefeasible right to his estate. If the scheme had been generally acted upon of course the fees would have covered the expense. With regard to the Middlesex Registry Court, the hon. Member (Mr. Alderman Lusk) had better ask a Question in the proper form.

Mr. KINNAIRD asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether it was not possible to find something for the Judge to do?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that as one of the Royal Judicature Commissioners, he had been endeavouring to find occupation for this unfortunate gentleman. He might add that he believed the failure in that office had arisen from the fact that the principle recommended by the original Commissioners, and embodied in a Bill introduced by Lord Cairns, had not been adopted. If the House would give effect to the Report of the Royal Commission which had been recently sitting he hoped that the Judge of this Court would have employment.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, a promise was made on a former occasion, when a Resolution on the subject was withdrawn, that the office should be amalgamated with some other office, by which the salaries would be saved.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £21,224, to complete the sum for Police Courts (London and Sheerness).

(9.) £141,449, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police.

(10.) £235,000, to complete the sum for County and Borough Police, Great Britain.

(11.) £208,712, to complete the sum for Government Prisons, England, and Transportation.

(12.) £175,632, to complete the sum for County Prisons and Reformatories, Great Britain.

(13.) £21,910, to complete the sum for Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.

(14.) £14,335, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges.

(15.) £50,198, to complete the sum for Criminal Proceedings in Scotland.

(16.) £36,764, to complete the sum for Courts of Law and Justice (Scotland).

(17.) £15,099, to complete the sum for Register House Departments (Scotland).

(18.) £16,949, to complete the sum for Prisons in Scotland.

(19.) £58,364, to complete the sum for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions in Ireland.

(20.) £29,379, to complete the sum for Court of Chancery (Ireland).

(21.) £20,097, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts (Ireland).

(22.) £5,510, to complete the sum for Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland).

(23.) £9,003, to complete the sum for Landed Estates Court (Ireland).

COLONEL FRENCH asked if there was any intention to reduce this Vote, seeing that there was very little business done in the court now?

MR. AYRTON said, he rather thought that a Bill they had just passed would find some further employment for this court; but if they should hear that the staff was more than necessary, of course they should reduce it.

Vote *agreed to.*

(24.) £7,380, to complete the sum for Probate Court (Ireland).

(25.) £1,130, to complete the sum for Admiralty Court Registry (Ireland).

MR. MUNTZ remarked that there was no necessity for a separate Court of Registry for Ireland.

MR. AYRTON said, this subject was reviewed last Session, and Parliament then thought fit to set up this court.

Vote *agreed to.*

(26.) £9,857, to complete the sum for Registry of Deeds in Ireland.

(27.) £2,262, to complete the sum for Registry of Judgments in Ireland.

(28.) 65,043, to complete the sum for Dublin Metropolitan Police.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK observed that this Vote was increasing every year, and he did not see why a rich town like Dublin should ask to have such an enormous sum from the public funds for the protection of its own property. Dublin should pay for her police force like other large towns in England and Scotland. He also asked for some explanation with respect to the item of compensation for offices abolished.

MR. AYRTON said, that that item referred to appointments abolished some sixteen or seventeen years ago, with the exception of one which was abolished in 1860, when certain changes were made in the department. With regard to the item for the Dublin police, it seemed, as placed in the Estimates, to be a Vote from the general Exchequer for the whole of the expenses of that body of police. That was the result of an arrangement made some few years ago, according to which the whole of the charge was brought upon the Estimates. He said nothing of the wisdom of that proceeding. The City of Dublin, however, contributed £41,000 towards the expenses, which was a great improvement on the rest of Ireland.

COLONEL FRENCH said, it was a great pity the Secretary to the Treasury had not been longer in Office, or he would have known more of the reasons for these charges being included in the Estimates. The fact was, that when the Corn Laws were repealed it was thought Ireland would suffer, and these charges were undertaken by the Imperial Government as some compensation to Ireland. Moreover, the revenue officers had been discharged, and their duties thrown on the police.

Vote *agreed to.*

(29.) £603,544, to complete the sum for Constabulary (Ireland).

(30.) £14,193, to complete the sum for Government Prisons and Reformatories in Ireland.

(31.) £6,000, to complete the sum for County Prisons in Ireland.

(32.) £3,272, to complete the sum for Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum.

COLONEL FRENCH observed that he should be sorry to disturb the general disposition of the House to vote anything asked for, and therefore he should make no objection to this Vote.

MR. MUNTZ said, that he should. There was a general increase in these Votes, and in order to test the feeling of the House he would move that the sum be reduced by £91 for incidental expenses.

MR. AYRTON said, these incidental expenses were all strictly audited before they were included in the Estimates.

MR. MUNTZ said, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Vote *agreed to.*

(33.) £1,730, to complete the sum for Four Courts Marshalsea Prison.

In answer to Mr. GOURLEY,

MR. AYRTON said, that imprisonment for debt was not yet abolished in Dublin. But when they put an end to the system, prisons for debtors would no longer be required in Dublin.

Vote *agreed to.*

(34.) £5,820, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges in Ireland.

(35.) £85,452, to complete the sum for Convict Establishments in the Colonies.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £155,667, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Missions and Embassies Abroad."

MR. RYLANDS rose to call attention to the excessive expenditure for Diplomatic and Consular Services, and to move a reduction on heads 1 and 2. He congratulated the Committee upon the fact that the charge for the diplomatic service was now, for the first time, included in the Estimates. In former years it was paid out of the Consolidated Fund, and it was a singular instance of the mode in which all questions relating to the diplomatic service had been treated in Parliament, and of the secresy in which everything connected with diplomacy was shrouded, that so much opposition had been offered in former Sessions to the reasonable proposals which had been made to give the House an opportunity of voting upon this branch of the national expenditure. In 1858, Mr. Wise moved—

> "That it is the opinion of this House that the Diplomatic Salaries and Pensions now charged upon the Consolidated Fund should be brought under the more immediate view and control of Parliament, and be paid out of a Vote annually provided by the House of Commons for the purpose."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlix. 1508.]

Lord Palmerston strongly opposed this Resolution, and said that if it were adopted it would—

> "Give Parliament the opportunity of detailed and constant intervention in the transactions connected with our diplomatic relations, would lead to consequences which I think there might be great reason to regret—would tend to the disturbance of all order, and to the consequent disquietude of our foreign relations."—[*Ibid.* 1520.]

He therefore—

> "Entreated and conjured the House not to sanction a proposal which, he believed, would be attended with most serious and injurious consequences to the public interests as connected with our foreign relations."—[*Ibid.* 1522.]

Under the influence of that appeal the House, of course, rejected Mr. Wise's reasonable proposal by a considerable majority. In 1863, the present Chairman of Committees (Mr. Dodson) moved a similar Resolution, which was opposed by the then Government and rejected by a small majority; and it was only last year that the Motion of Mr. Labouchere to the same effect was carried by a majority of 4, notwithstanding the opposition of the front Benches on each side of the House. They had now, in consequence of that Resolution, the opportunity of dealing with a most important Vote, and he thought before granting £250,000 to this service there should be some consideration as to whether or not the country got an adequate return for so large an expenditure. His own opinion was that they did not get an adequate return, and he was supported in that belief by the opinions expressed by Mr. Cobden on one of the last occasions when he addressed the House. Mr. Cobden, in his speech in 1854, on the Foreign Office and Board of Trade, said—

> "We have a vast and expensive machinery engaged in our diplomacy, and our manufacturing and trading community expect that our diplomatists shall devote some attention to our commercial interests abroad. Will anybody say that the employment of that machinery during the last few years has been satisfactory to this House or to the country? We have little mountains of blue books on Schleswig-Holstein, and does not everybody agree that they are unsatisfactory? Diplomacy has broken down in its own vocation, and the dynastic arrangements of Europe and the balance of power are questions which have ceased to engage the sympathies of the British public."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 1118, 1119.]

He (Mr. Rylands) did not say that there should be an entire cessation of the diplomatic system, but he thought the expenses in connection with it should be reduced, and that a great change should be made in the number and character of the agencies in connection with the service. Formerly it was believed in this country that it was the duty of Great Britain to interfere in every complication that arose upon the Continent. There was a superstition that this nation had to act the part of a second Providence in guiding and over-ruling the affairs of mankind; but these ideas had now very much declined, and a meddling, or, as it had been properly styled, a "muddling" foreign policy was generally condemned. That change of policy must necessarily have restricted the operations of the diplomatic service, and the discoveries of modern times—railroads and telegraphs, with all other facilities for international communication—should also have lessened the expenditure, but it still went on increasing. He might have had some hesitation in calling attention to this excessive expenditure were he not fortified in his opinions by the Report of an important Committee which, in 1850, sat upon the subject of Official Salaries; and, as he should especially rely upon their conclusions, he wished to point out that the Committee was composed of men of the highest character, who not only commanded the confidence of the Parliament which appointed them, but whose opinions must still have great weight with the House. The Committee consisted of Colonel Wilson-Patten, Chairman; Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, Sir John Yarde Buller, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Napier, Mr. Home Drummond, Mr. W. Evans, Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Henley, Mr. Ellice, Mr. Ricardo, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Deedes. In their Report the Committee stated that they had given much patient consideration to the subject of our diplomatic expenditure, and had entertained a variety of opinions upon it; they had, however, decided to recommend a complete revision of the present system of our diplomatic establishments, and with that view they adopted five important Resolutions, to which he begged to call especial attention. The first was—

> "That it be recommended to the Government to propose to the Governments of France and Turkey to convert the Embassies now maintained between those countries and England into missions, and that our diplomatic establishments at Paris and Constantinople be put on the footing of first-class missions."

That recommendation, however, had not received the slightest attention from the Foreign Office. Lord John Russell, who was a member of the Committee, and joined in that recommendation, not only did not assist in carrying it out, but acted directly in its teeth by raising three missions into embassies. His belief was that the advantage derived from Lord Russell's management of our foreign relations did not compensate for the additional expense he had thrown on the Foreign Department. The three missions, which Lord Russell raised to the rank of embassies in 1862, were those of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna, and the effect of this change was that the salaries, including house rent, were increased as follows:—St. Petersburg, from £6,900 to £9,000; Berlin, from £5,164 to £8,000; and Vienna, from £6,900 to £9,200; and there was, in addition, the increased charge for outfits. This he considered a most unjustifiable step, as there was nothing either in our political or diplomatic relations with the countries in which these embassies were maintained to warrant such an expenditure. That was the way in which the first Resolution of the Committee was met. The second Resolution was—

> "That it be recommended to the serious attention of the Government that a single mission at some central point in Germany may be substituted for the several missions now existing at Hanover, Dresden, Stuttgard, Munich, and Frankfort, without detriment to the public service."

That Resolution had also been neglected, for, although the German War had caused some modification of our diplomatic relations with that country, we were still spending a sum of £11,565 per annum in supporting our various small German missions. The third Resolution recommended to the Government to make arrangements for uniting the mission at Florence with one of the Italian missions, and no doubt the Foreign Office would have treated that recommendation with the same indifference as the rest, but we had to thank Victor Emmanuel for having carried it out. The fourth recommendation was that no diplomatic salary should exceed £5,000 per annum, exclusive of an allowance for a residence. How that Resolution was treated may be seen from the fact that at present we had six diplomatic salaries which exceeded £5,000, and instead of a decrease, there was an increase. The total cost of the salaries exceeding £5,000 was £46,800, and if the recommendation of the Committee had been followed, that amount would have been reduced to £30,000. The Committee likewise recommended to the Government a revision of the whole of the diplomatic service, regard being had to the maximum suggested by the Commitee and to the relative importance of the various missions, and that in certain cases a union of missions might take place, or a consul or consular agent be substituted for a mission, whereby considerable saving might be effected without injury to the public service; but that particular recommendation had been treated with the same disregard as the rest during the last twenty years. The aggregate cost of the various small missions still maintained in Europe — including those in the Netherlands and Switzerland—amounted to £19,265 per annum. The work done at those missions was very trifling indeed, and the advantage derived from it by this country was also very trifling. Mr. Labouchere, in his speech last year, said—

> "He had been at a great many of those missions; he knew what was done in them; and he could assure the House it was absolutely nothing." —[3 *Hansard*, excii. 929.]

In Africa, and still more in South America, our diplomatic expenditure exhibited the same extravagance. The total cost of the South American missions alone, including those for the Argentine Republic, the Brazils, Monte Video, Peru, Venezuela, and other States, was £22,495 per annum. Those missions were exactly of the character that was contemplated in the fifth Resolution of the Official Salaries Committee; and he said again that the recommendations of that Committee had been totally neglected. The probable saving that would be effected if the Report of the Committee of 1850 had been carried out would be as follows: — On diplomatic salaries over £5,000, a sum of £16,800, with an additional £1,200, for outfits, &c.; on small German missions reduced or abolished, £8,000; on the missions in Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, Spain, Morocco, and Persia, if reduced, £8,000; and from the abolition of the South American missions and the substitution of consuls general, £14,000, with an additional £2,000 on outfits and other expenses. The total saving under those several different heads would have been £50,000 per annum, which in twenty years would have amounted to £1,000,000 sterling. Not only, however, had there been no attempt at reduction, but the whole tendency of diplomatic salaries had been towards an increase. The diplomatic salaries paid out of the Consolidated Fund in 1850 amounted to £140,000, and their estimated cost for the year 1869 was £155,538, showing an increase of £15,538. The charge for consular establishments abroad in 1850 was £148,690; whereas the estimate for 1869 for general services was £166,798, which, together with a sum of £94,653 for China, Japan, and Siam, made a total of £261,451, thus showing an increase of £112,761. Adding to that the increase of £15,538 on the diplomatic salaries, they had a total increase since 1850 of £128,299. He now came to the extraordinary expenses of Ministers at Foreign Courts, which in 1851 amounted to £16,000, and which gradually crept up to £40,000 in 1858, and in 1868 they remained at £40,000. It was time some effectual check was put by the Treasury and the Foreign Office upon those expenses, which had materially increased at all the large embassies. These incidental charges were of such a character as to give rise to the suspicion that they might furnish opportunities for peculation and fraud. The expenses in France had increased from £841 to £3,219; Russia, from £404 to £1,859; Turkey, from £5,270 to £9,263; Prussia, from £657 to £1,356; Portugal, from £476 to £1,221; and the United States, from £650 to £3,521. He would next make a comparison between the cases of Turkey and the United States of America. The total amount of our export and import trade with Turkey in 1867 was £10,769,087, whereas our export and import trade with the United States amounted in 1867 to £62,869,735. The shipping tonnage employed in our trade with Turkey in 1867 was 299,731 tons; and the tonnage employed in our trade with the United States was 2,033,105 tons. Let him next compare our diplomatic and consular expenses in the two cases. In Turkey we maintained an Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at £8,000 a year, and in addition to that there were charges for the Secretary to the Embassy, attachés, dragomans, and various kinds of servants. Altogether our diplomatic and consular expenses in Turkey reached nearly £50,000 a year. In the United States, with which we had six times the amount of trade and more than seven times the amount of tonnage, the salary of the Envoy Extraordinary was £5,000, of the Secretary of Legation £700, while the various diplomatic and consular charges made a total of £22,171, or less than one-half of our expenditure in connection with Turkey. There was an item of £1,000 for a house for an Ambassador to the United States. It was quite refreshing to see a sum of that amount for such a purpose. He believed there was no doubt that the interest of the original outlay and the cost of repairs on the Ambassador's house at Constantinople must have amounted to £10,000 or £12,000 a year for the last twenty years. Whenever we wanted to look for extravagant expenditure we had only to go to Turkey. The Committee would find that for the dragomans, clerks, and translators we paid £3,650 a year in Turkey, while in the United States, as the language was the same as our own, we paid nothing. Lord Palmerston, when giving evidence before the Committee of 1850, was asked how it was that we required such a large staff of paid attachés at Constantinople? His reply was—

> "It has long been thought that it was desirable the intercourse between our Embassy and the Turkish Government should be carried on by British subjects; it is obviously desirable for many reasons. . . . And therefore I established a system to provide for instructing a certain number of young Englishmen in the Turkish language sufficiently to qualify them hereafter for the duties of interpreters, and that accounts for the number of paid attachés there. Some of them are young men studying the Turkish language, for the purpose of becoming hereafter official interpreters between our Embassy and the Porte."

Lord Palmerston was also asked about the particular functions of the "Oriental Secretary." He replied that his duties were translating, interpreting, and instructing those young men. Lord Palmerston was further asked—

> "When those young men are competent from their knowledge of the Oriental languages to take the office of interpreter, what staff does your Lordship contemplate having?"

He replied—

> "I should think, probably, that two paid attachés might be sufficient, but of that I can hardly judge; it would be necessary to have the opinion of the Ambassador."

Of course the necessity for paying exorbitant salaries to dragomans was to be got rid of by this arrangement. It appeared that members of the same family were employed by Russians, French, and English, the office of dragoman being a sort of hereditary office. These men were paid as agents to transmit secret communications between the embassies and the Porte; but if there had been any object in keeping the secrets he ventured to say they never would have been kept. Well, notwithstanding the promise of Lord Palmerston, there was still a very large expenditure for dragomans, and we had in no way lessened our expenses for attachés. In 1850 our expenditure for the Secretaries of Legation amounted to £2,500; it was now £2,950, an increase of £450; while for dragomans it was £3,650 now, as against £3,300 in 1850, or an increase of £350. He would put it to the Committee whether it was reasonable to persist in such an expenditure? What had become of the four interesting young Englishmen who were learning the Turkish language in 1850? He believed they were alive, and that there was no difficulty in tracing them. As soon as they had got a certain knowledge of the Turkish language, and were able, perhaps, to speak a few common-place words of social intercourse, they were drafted off to other parts of the world, where their acquaintance with the Turkish language would not stand them in stead. He was very sorry the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Sir Henry Bulwer) was not in his place, for he had there a despatch written by Lord Russell when he was at the Foreign Office. That despatch was of a very extraordinary character, and was addressed to the right hon. Gentleman when Ambassador at Constantinople. It bore date the 20th of January, 1860. Lord Russell called attention to the fact that the charge for boats, boatmen, and horse-hire, which in 1853-4 amounted to £899 7*s.* 1*d.*, had increased year by year until in 1858-9 it reached the sum of £1,352 15*s.* 5*d.* Lord Russell said—"This enormous increase of expenditure under one particular head calls for strict inquiry." The case was really worse than Lord Russell stated, as in 1850-1 this charge for boats, boatmen, &c., was only £453 4*s.* 3*d.* He regretted very much that the right hon. Gentleman was not in his place to give some explanation, but he was making no charge against the right hon. Gentleman with respect to the matter. What he wished to call attention to was this —that almost immediately after the despatch of Lord Russell this expenditure for boats, boatmen, and horse-hire began to decline, and disappeared altogether in the course of three or four years. The probable explanation of the charge was that it was the cost of trips on the Bosphorus for the young attachés. But we had not got rid of excessive expenditure in connection with this embassy. There was another item, that of "miscellaneous expenses," which in 1860 was £520; but which in 1869 had jumped up to £2,006. The item for miscellaneous expenses amounted to only £57 in the United States; and fuel and light were put down at £220 for Turkey and nothing for the United States. He had found that under the head of illuminations and fêtes in 1862, the embassy at Turkey spent £236 18*s*. 2*d*., while in Spain, in the year 1863, the expenditure under the same head was only 15*s*. 7*d*. He scarcely knew how a fête and illumination could be got up for 15*s*. 7*d*.; but, at any rate, it showed that, like an elephant's trunk, our embassies could take up large or small things with equal ease. Lord Russell, in the same despatch, called Sir Henry Bulwer's attention to the fact that, from 1846 to 1853, the average expenditure at Constantinople for extraordinary expenses, exclusive of dragomans, was £2,700 a year, but that it had risen to an average of £5,000 from 1854 to 1857; and Lord Russell upon this stated to Sir Henry Bulwer that he must see how necessary it was for the Government to be able to give Parliament some explanation of so great an increase, and he urged him to bring the expenditure within the limits of former years. So far from that having been done, the expenditure increased since Lord Russell wrote that despatch. Again, he objected to the large sum paid for special missions, and wished to know why it was that, supposing a foreign potentate had to be invested with an English order of knighthood, it could not be done by the Ambassador at the Court in question, instead of the country having to pay large sums to Peers to proceed to Foreign Courts and perform the investiture. In the present Estimates there were charges for Earl Vane investing the Emperor of Russia with the Order of the Garter, and for a similar mission of Lord Bath to the Emperor of Austria. He hoped that items of this nature would disappear from the Estimates in future years. The question was —how was this expenditure to be reduced? It appeared to him, first, that the Government ought to look at the Report of the Committee of 1850 on Official Salaries, and see whether they could carry out the recommendations of the Committee. Another thing that should be done was that the service should cease to be a close preserve for the aristocracy, and that it should no longer be used for the purpose of display, of luxury, and of extravagance. He would be the last to join in any vulgar cry about the aristocracy; but he objected to the diplomatic service being monopolized by any one class to the exclusion of ability. He regretted the absence of the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Layard), because, in 1855, he took the pains to go through the Foreign Office List, and the summary he gave to the House showed how largely it was composed of members of the aristocracy. He showed the House that there were acting as—

> "Heads of missions, seven Lords, nine honourables, two baronets, three members of noble families, and seven gentlemen—nearly all small missions—twenty-one against seven. Secretaries of Legation, two Lords, nine honourables, one baronet, five members of noble families, and seven gentlemen—seventeen against seven."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxxviii. 2062.]

The paid attachés and unpaid attachés were very much the same, and the total gave twelve Lords, thirty honourables, and twenty-five members of noble families, or sixty-seven out of 110. He (Mr. Rylands) had omitted the Baronets, because some of his hon. Friends objected to be classed among the aristocracy. Mr. Layard, remarking upon this summary, said—

> "What is the result of such a system as this? Why, honest, able, hard-working men give themselves up to despair, or get into a morbid state, and become unable to serve the public as they were wont to do. The system literally destroys them. There are a great many other cases, all of which are equally bad; and let the House take my word for it, for I have been engaged in diplomacy and in the Foreign Office—there is nothing but favouritism in diplomacy." — [*Ibid*, 2062-3.]

It had been remarked by a writer, who

had experience in this part of the public service, that—

> "In France, in Prussia, in America, and in most of the other countries in the world, men rise in the diplomatic service by the mere force of great merit, of singular aptitude and ability. But in England high birth, considerable fortune, Parliamentary connections, or aristocratic influence, are the chief passports to the best employments in embassies and foreign missions."

He was afraid there was much truth in that; it was the natural result of the close system, which was aggravated by the practice of having unpaid attachés, who entered the service without pay, in the hope of becoming Ambassadors and Ministers of State, and whose sole idea was to keep up the honour of the country by mere expenditure. Sir Hamilton Seymour, a man of very great distinction, stated before the Select Committee of 1850—

> "I consider that giving dinners is an essential part of diplomacy; I have no hesitation in saying so. I have no idea of a man being a good diplomatist who does not give good dinners."

The ruling idea seemed to be that Ambassadors should have large salaries and live in state, but he did not believe that system would secure better things for the country than the quiet, inexpensive custom of the United States Ambassadors. No doubt in former times power was to be gained by magnificent displays upon the part of the Sovereign's representative; but in these days, when every State was accurately measured by its neighbours, such displays were useless for any purpose the nation had in view. The inaptness of the present system was shown by the regularity with which we sent special Ambassadors in all cases when we desired to negotiate a treaty. We sent Lord Ashburton to the United States, Lord Elgin to Canada, Mr. Elliot to Greece; and, perhaps, the best illustration of his point was Mr. Cobden's mission to negotiate the French Treaty. Notwithstanding all this expensive machinery in Paris, as soon as something important had to be done it must be supplemented by something else. So long as the present close system was maintained the inefficiency and expensiveness of our diplomacy could not be got rid of. Perhaps he could not do better than quote the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn upon this subject. Lord Stanley, in 1853, after he had served in Lord Derby's first Administration as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, spoke strongly against the close-service training system—

> "He believed the whole system by which diplomacy was made an exclusive service might safely be abolished, and that a system analogous to that adopted in the public offices at home might be established. His belief was that the knowledge which the training was supposed to confer on the superior diplomatic servants with regard to the details of diplomatic business might be easily supplied by attaching to the missions abroad persons who should act in the same capacity as the clerks of our public offices at home, who should be previously trained to the service, and whose duty it should be to furnish all the necessary professional knowledge which such superior diplomatic Ministers might require, and of which, coming new to the business, they must necessarily be deficient. By having such a body of men to render that assistance, the door of the diplomatic service might be thrown open, and they might then appoint any public officer to the higher ranks of diplomacy, whose merits and general acquirements in other respects might entitle him to the appointment."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxv. 882.]

The right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire fully supported Lord Stanley's views, and said that—

> "The present system was an imperfect training; it was merely a nominal and not a real training. . . . . It was his firm belief that, sooner or later, they would have a reform of the diplomatic service on the principle laid down by his noble Friend, and he believed that by carrying out that principle they would render the service much more efficient and much more economical." — [*Ibid.* cxxv. 886-7.]

The effect of this change in the diplomatic service would do away with the great disadvantage which now arose from the constant changes that were made in Secretaries of Legation, who were frequently removed from the posts they occupied. In fact, under the new regulations proclaimed by Lord Russell in 1862, second and third Secretaries and attachés were, as a general rule, not allowed to remain in any mission more than two years. The prejudicial effect of this system was shown by Lord Cowley who, in his evidence before the Select Committee, of 1861, said that in his experience at Paris—

> "He found that from the constant change of attachés and particularly of the upper attachés, by promotion, when a question presented itself suddenly there was often nobody there competent to give him any information on the subject."

The only other branch of expenditure in connection with the service to which he would allude was that of diplomatic pensions. The Committee of 1850 remarked how large a proportion the aggregate amount of pensions bore to the sum paid for actual service. Among diplomatic pensions charged on the Consolidated Fund there were five amounting to £4,700, which were received by gentlemen all willing and able to serve. These were Sir James Hudson, who was forced to retire from Turin under circumstances that were of a "fishy" character, Sir Alexander Malet, Mr. Percy Doyle, Mr. Scarlett, and Mr. Christie. He was aware that when a man got out of the service it was difficult to put him in again, because the pressure of new men seeking service and of those desiring promotion was so great that any re-appointment was unpopular. But if these gentlemen were employed their pensions would be saved to the public. On a recent occasion, when speaking about the expenses of the Embassy house at Constantinople, the Secretary to the Treasury said he had merely to deal with the state of things as he found them. That would hardly be considered a satisfactory reply on the part of the present Government when the question came to be discussed next year. The fact of their finding things was no reason for maintaining them, but rather a reason for doing away with them. While Members had been gratified at finding the Army and Navy Estimates reduced, they had been disappointed at finding no change in the Civil Service Estimates, in which it was difficult for a private Member to deal with extravagance. At the last General Election there were two great questions which interested electors —one was the Irish Church, and the other was the necessity of economy in the public expenditure. The Civil Service Estimates this year were either stationary or exhibited an increase; there were all sorts of objectionable items; and next year, if these Estimates did not exhibit an earnest desire to reduce expenditure, he hoped they would be returned to the Treasury for revision. He hoped, however, that an assurance would be given now that, during the Recess, a serious attempt would be made to check extravagance, and that the Government would pay some attention to the opinions of the Committee of 1850, the carrying out of which would conduce to economy and efficiency in the public service, and at the same time gratify the public. He concluded by moving that the Vote be reduced by £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £145,667, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Missions and Embassies Abroad." —(*Mr. Rylands.*)

MR. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, it was quite refreshing to have the voting of increase after increase checked by such a speech as they had just heard. Without agreeing in everything the hon. Member had said, he thanked the hon. Member for the great trouble he had taken, and for the great knowledge he had displayed with reference to the question before them. If hon. Members would only follow his example and pay as much attention to different portions of the Civil Service Estimates, we should not have the unsatisfactory reasons for increase after increase that had been given by the Secretary to the Treasury this Session. He never before heard so many unsatisfactory reasons for additions to the Estimates. During his canvass he was followed by those who charged him with belonging to the extravagant party, to the party that had increased the expenditure of the country and would take no pains to diminish it, and he began to think there must be some truth in what they said, and also to anticipate that considerable diminution in the expenditure would be made by the present Government; but he had been much disappointed. It had been asked, what were the remedies. They were to bring as much knowledge to bear on the subject as the hon. Member for Warrington had done; to propose, as he had done, the reduction of a Vote, to give reasons for doing so, and, above all things, to divide.

MR. KINNAIRD said, they were now experiencing the advantages of having these Estimates submitted to the House. He thanked the hon. Member for Warrington for the valuable contribution which he had made towards solving the question of the expenditure on the diplomatic service. The speech of the hon. Member would excite the greatest interest in the country; and it was much to be regretted that it had not been heard by the Prime Minister, than whom no one was more anxious to reduce unnecessary expenditure. There was one small item to which he desired to call attention, and this was the payment of £300 a year for a chaplain to the Embassy at Paris. The chapel in the Rue d'Auguesseau was originally designed as the Embassy chapel, and where Protestant services were illegal, it was necessary to resort to an embassy for accommodation for public worship; but in Paris no such necessity existed, and a salary of £300 a year for a chaplain could be saved without the slightest inconvenience. When the building grant was disallowed by the House, the chapel had to be sold, but at the sale the Government reserved a right to occupy the Embassy gallery should it be deemed desirable to do so. Consequently the gallery, which contained forty sittings, had never been let, but had been reserved for the use of the Ambassador. The only duties of the Embassy chaplain were the performance of morning service on Sundays, and the celebration of marriages; but the marriages could as well be solemnized by the incumbent of the Rue d'Auguesseau Church, who held a license from the late Bishop of London, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, and the marriage fees would serve as some compensation for the reservation of the gallery for the Ambassador and his suite.

Colonel SYKES said, that out of 142 votes in the Civil Service Estimates sixty-nine were this year increased in amount, the total increase being not less than £200,000, a lamentable contrast to the Army and Navy Estimates. That increase had been going on from year to year, and he wanted to know when it was to stop. There was a charge of £4,301 for couriers, being an increase of £1,517 over last year. Was there any necessity for this large outlay at the present time? There was also a large item for telegrams, to which he did not object; but, if the telegraph could be so much used, the services of couriers might be dispensed with, except in very rare cases. He saw an increase of £2,000 in special missions this year. What justification was there for that increase? Many of the items in this Vote might be reduced if the Secretary to the Treasury would turn his attention to them, and he hoped that next year the House would have an improved edition of the Civil Service Estimates.

Mr. MUNTZ said, he should not vote for this Motion if he could not make out a larger sum for reduction than that proposed by his hon. Friend. There were charges for houses and legations at capitals within the North German Confederation which had, by arrangement with the King of Prussia, given up all diplomatic business. For Dresden there was an item of £1,250, although it was well known that the King of Saxony had no power to enter into any treaty with us, diplomatic or commercial. There was a mission at Coburg, which was altogether about half the size of Brighton, and where there could be nothing for our representative to do. There was another at Darmstadt, one-half of which was in the North German Confederation. Würtemburg and Bavaria were in the Zollverein. If the Government abolished the Embassies at Bavaria, £4,500; Würtemberg, £2,800; Coburg, £850; Dresden, £950; and Darmstadt, £700, that would give them £9,800, and then if the £300 for the Embassy house at Paris were added it would give the Treasury £100 more than it wanted to enable it to make the reduction recommended by his hon. Friend. He could tell the Government that the House looked to them for economy, and if they did not give it they were not worth having. The cry at the last election was the enormous expenditure of the then Government, and if the Civil Estimates were to be increased £200,000 a year, the House and the country would not suffer it.

Sir HENRY BULWER: I regret not to have been present to hear the speech delivered by the hon. Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands); first, because I hear it was a speech of much ability; and, secondly, because I am told that the hon. Member alluded to a despatch addressed to me by Lord Russell relative to the extraordinary expenses at Constantinople. Lord Russell, in that despatch, drew a comparison between the expenses of 1846 and those of 1860. I remember that despatch; but the increase which it pointed out commenced before I was Ambassador to the Porte, and is readily accounted for. Lord Russell forgot that telegrams were not charged in 1846, and were charged subsequently. Special messengers also having been diminished, postage had augmented. But the main reason for the great increase of extraordinary expenditure at Constantinople was the increase, to an almost inconceivable extent, which occurred in the rate of wages after the Crimean War. Boat-hire, which cost 1*s.* a day previous to that period, cost 4*s.* a day afterwards; and, in the same way, the hire of a horse became four times greater. This told the more, because, in Constantinople, it must be remembered there was no penny post; everything which had to be sent had to be sent by messenger, and very often upon horseback. Boatmen's wages, also, rose enormously at the same time. All these differences in prices had to be entered in the public accounts, and necessarily caused a great increase in the expenses defrayed by Government, as they did in the expenses which the members of the diplomatic body had to defray for themselves. In considering the Constantinople Embassy, moreover, we must remember that it is not merely an Embassy; the Ambassador is, practically, a Colonial Governor as well as an Ambassador; and much of the extra expenditure must be called colonial. I confess, indeed, that I was startled when the first statement of it was brought before me, and when I saw how little control I had over the items. There were the dragomans, the judicial and consular establishments, and a variety of other kinds of expenditure which might almost be called stereotyped, and which were altogether independent of me as Ambassador. Much of this was required; but I may frankly state that, in my opinion, reductions could be effected without loss of efficiency to the public service. I feel considerable repugnance to state in the House of Commons what these are, because I might seem to be taking advantage of my present position to insist upon observations and suggestions which I made formerly and fruitlessly. But I certainly will take an opportunity of communicating upon this subject with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and shall reserve to myself full discretion as to what I may say on a future occasion touching this matter. In the meantime, let me assure the hon. Gentleman, whose Motion we are now discussing, that I am far from being an enemy to diplomatic reform. On the contrary, I might almost say I am the earliest diplomatic reformer in England, for I claim the credit of having effected, or, at least, of having been the earliest advocate of, two reforms. One of these, having reference to the expediency of submitting gentlemen who enter the diplomatic profession to examination; and the other to the furnishing by the secretaries of Legation, or Embassy, of the periodical reports which have tended very much to heighten the character and bring out the solid merits of gentlemen of the diplomatic profession. Still, I am bound to add that, although one or two of the reforms which, in former times, I advocated warmly, and not without making for myself many enemies, have been successful, there are other suggestions with which I then accompanied those proposals, respecting which I have been convinced, by time and experience, that I was in error. It is only fair that I should state this, as, perhaps, I am not as ardent in my notions of reform now as many Gentlemen around me are, or as I myself was at the time when I first had a seat in Parliament. Reform, at all events, in any important Department of the State, must be looked at in two ways—first, with regard to diminishing its faults, and next with regard to improving its efficiency. I object equally to economy which cripples efficiency, and to expenditure which does not add to it; and a careful and constant investigation of all the particulars of the service, in order to ascertain where parsimony is injurious and expenditure extravagant, should be constantly going on. But if asked if I believe that the appointment of a Committee with this object will be beneficial, I would venture to make the same reply that the eminent poet, Mr. Coleridge, made to the lady who asked him whether he believed in ghosts—"I have seen so many that I do not believe in them." I have, in fact, seen so many Committees, and there are so many Reports of Committees which hon. Members have the opportunity of studying in the Library, and which they seem to have studied with so small a result, that I cannot, I repeat, believe in their efficiency. If what is necessary to be done is not done by the responsible Officers of the Crown who preside over the Department, perhaps the best thing to do—because the most authoritative—will be to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the best means of diminishing official expenditure and establishing official improvements. My hon. Friend the Member for Warrington drew, as I understand, a comparison between the diplomacy of the United States and that of Great Britain; but my hon. Friend must go further, and draw a comparison between the institutions of the two countries. The First Magistrate of the United States receives a salary of £5,000; whereas, to retain the benefits of monarchy, we are content and happy to pay £300,000. There is no Archbishop of Canterbury in the United States, there is no Lord High Chancellor, no Duke of Devonshire, no Marquess of Salisbury—persons who, with great salaries or fortunes, perform great services to the State, but whose very titles testify to the existence of a different order of society from that of the United States. Having resided in those States for some time, it may be interesting to point out why there could be no satisfactory comparison instituted between the diplomatic service of the two countries. When the election of President is over, all former holders of places are discarded—high and low—and those who have been forward in securing the recent election put forward a certain number of candidates for home office, and a certain number of candidates for diplomatic situations. These are generally gentlemen prominent in the canvass, either connected with the Press or the legal profession—anxious, at any rate, to visit Europe, and satisfied, with a moderate allowance, to undertake an agreeable trip; the gentlemen to satisfy an intelligent curiosity, and the ladies to improve their daughters in the pianoforte. They are, no doubt, intelligent men, and those selected to come to England being always men of distinction, and finding a language and customs ready made for them, justify their position. In other countries they are not, perhaps, so successful; and, at all events, I remember when a Committee was sitting here to improve our diplomacy on the American model, a Committee was sitting in the United States to improve the American diplomacy after the model of ours. So little are we all satisfied with what belongs to us. If we desire to draw a fair comparison, we should look at the diplomacy of France, and in the French Estimates we shall find that some of the posts in the diplomatic service of that country are even more costly than those of England. The French Government are in the habit of paying their Ambassadors as large salaries, and in certain instances larger, salaries than ours receive, and therefore, in comparison, the salaries our Ambassadors receive are not extravagant. Moreover, when a distinguished diplomatic servant of the French Government returns to his country he is created a member of the Senate as a matter of course, with an endowment of so much a year in addition to his pension, and he is generally regarded as a candidate for the highest offices of State. Messrs. Thouvenel, Moustier, and Lavalette, who were my colleagues, have all become, in turn, Ministers of Foreign Affairs on their return to their own country. The hon. Member has commented upon the Committee of 1850. What did that Committee propose? It suggested that our Ambassadors should be turned into Ministers, and our Ministers into commercial and political agents; that no one should receive more than £5,000 a year; and that, where possible, Legations should be consolidated. I see no advantage in making Ambassadors Ministers, because I do not see any reason why a man should be paid more because he is an Ambassador than if he were Minister. Every gentleman who represents his country at an important place should have a salary suited to the requirements of the post, and no more. The title really makes no difference, except that the higher the title the greater the consideration; and I do not see why our representative should not have all the consideration we can give him when we do not pay additional for it.

As to making Ministers political agents, my experience tells me that small diplomatists make great difficulties. In fact, one of the most eminent of living Sovereigns, who takes a very active part in the affairs of his country, said to me one day—"My consular and political agents give more trouble than all my Ambassadors put together." There are some political agents at places where it would not be proper to send Ministers. Egypt and the Principalities, for instance. The gentlemen in these places are, in fact, diplomatists, and oftentimes, as now, useful and able within the sphere where they are employed. But when a man is a political agent as well as a commercial agent, he too often devotes his attention exclusively to his political duties, while his commercial duties are treated as though they were beneath his attention; and, whilst not having the opportunity of comparison, he believes that the place at which he is stationed is the most important in Europe—he believes himself the most important person in it—and that the fate of the world depends on the trifles which he is rarely thanked for having noticed. There are, no doubt, some clever and able men whom I highly esteem, who are commercial and political agents; but, as a rule, I should say, have diplomatists, diplomatists, and consuls, consuls—things made for two purposes are rarely good for either. With respect to the maximum salary of £5,000, this salary, with the addition of house rent, is a fair one; but there can be no universal rule. When I was at Constantinople I had to live in a large palace, which was more fitted for a Sovereign than for an Ambassador, and which would have required an expenditure of at least three times my salary to keep up properly. When we oblige an Ambassador to live in such a palace, we should, at all events, give him a salary that will enable him to light and warm it. I am myself an advocate for a system recommended by the Committee of 1860—that is, of a certain salary, and an additional allowance for hospitality and representation. As it is, more is frequently expected from Ambassadors and Ministers, in this way, than they can afford, or less is done than the public has a right to expect. As I am here noticing details, there is another detail I venture to notice. A British Minister has two months leave of absence in the year; but no allowance whatever is made for the place in which he resides. If a man is in Paris or Brussels he can come to London in twelve hours and spend the whole of his two months as a vacation; but if he is stationed in Constantinople, or Greece, or the United States, something like a month of the time granted to him must be consumed when he is coming home and returning. For any one at Pekin or in Persia, two months leave, indeed, is of no use at all. An allowance ought to be made for the time necessarily spent by the Ambassador or Minister in travelling from and to his post; and he should be allowed, as secretaries are allowed, to take two leaves together, if in one year no leave is taken. As to the consolidation of Legations, I believe that in the case of two States situate close to each other, whose interests are similar, a saving can be effected by making the one Minister serve for both States; because, if the Foreign policy of these two States is identical, and the policy we pursue towards them is identical, it is better to have one person accredited to them, who will naturally keep them together, than two who may possibly feel and encourage rivalry and tend to keep them apart. It has been complained that new men were promoted, when others, able and fit for service, were kept on pensions. I cannot disagree with the doctrine that it is advisable to employ experienced men when their services are available for important posts. I am personally acquainted with men of high ability, and of much experience, who are not employed; while men of less experience—and, as it seems to me, of less ability—have been appointed to posts which they might fill, and that thus there is an increase of expense to the State, a diminution of efficiency in the service, and a mere gain to the Minister of the day of patronage and preferment. A certain latitude should be allowed to a Government in this respect; but that latitude should have its limits. The great changes which have happened in Germany have put an end to the mission at Frankfort. It was through no fault of Sir Alexander Malet that his post at Frankfort was abolished. Sir Alexander is an accomplished gentleman, and a man of great experience. Why has he not been put into one of the missions that have become vacant since his own was annihilated, instead of gentlemen his inferiors in rank, in service, and talent? I repeat that experience is a very great thing in diplomacy. It is that which one learns in this profession day by day, almost without feeling that one learns it; it is the knowledge of men and of judging events — knowledge which no theory can furnish—that is really the most valuable, and which a statesman at the head of affairs should most prize. One word more. In looking to general reductions the House ought to look to general expenditure, and not fall on one service in particular because it has few defenders. The Department which has to preserve the maintenance of peace is as worthy of consideration as the Department which has to provide for the eventuality of war; but according to the proverb, *Les absens ont toujours tort;* and whilst the Army has many to stand up in its support, the diplomacy can only lift up one or two voices in its behalf. Yet let us look at the two Departments. In the year 1837 our Army cost little more than £4,000,000; it now costs nearly £17,000,000, so that the charge for it has quadrupled since 1837. If regard is had to new missions, and to the fact that gentlemen who were formerly styled *attachés*, and served without pay, now, as secretaries, receive salaries, it will be found that the cost of the diplomatic establishments has but slightly increased since 1837, whereas living abroad has almost doubled. In the consular department it is true there has been a very considerable increase. In 1837 the cost of the consular service was £80,000, now it is £260,000. I think a great reduction might be made in that service, if we discard prejudice and have the courage to make it. I confess myself opposed to the system which I have seen in operation, more especially in the East, which is dotted over with Englishmen acting as British Consuls. Of some of these gentlemen I can say that if they keep themselves clean they have not wherewithal to pay their washerwomen. There is a notion, and a very false one, that distant and obscure places must be cheap, and an English gentleman is given £150 to £200 a year to starve on discreditably in some of these places. Where Englishmen are employed as British Consuls I would have them paid well, and I would have none but efficient men appointed; but in cases in which the place is not of sufficient importance to justify the Government in paying properly an efficient Englishman as consul, I would appoint the most respectable foreigner that could be got to take the office, without pay. Foreigners attach much importance to the office of British Consul. It gives them a position, and, in other respects, is of advantage to them, and you might often get a better foreign agent without a salary than a British agent could be with an insufficient salary. It is difficult, in this incidental and rambling way, to run over the various improvements and reductions of which, I think, the diplomacy at present admits; but, in conclusion, I protest, whilst making such improvements and reductions, against lowering its character, and providing inadequately for its wants. We should remember the encouragement to talent in other paths of life:—in the Army, in the Church, and at the bar there are great dignities and large emoluments. In trade and commerce rank is more easily attained, and fortune is more often acquired, now than in former times. I do not think, therefore, that this is the moment at which we ought to lower the position or diminish the prizes of a profession, of which no one who is conversant with its duties can doubt the importance. Our representatives are obliged by their calling to mix with persons the highest in rank, in wealth, and political influence. They have to support the *prestige* and the dignity of the British Government and the British nation. On their sagacity, their judgment, and proper management of the affairs intrusted to them, depend, in no small degree, the maintenance of peace, the prospects of commerce, and the general harmony of our relations with foreign countries. I know that it is difficult for the public to appreciate the merits of the diplomatic service. The words of Lord Melbourne, as applied to a deceased statesman in the other House of Parliament, live in my memory—

> "My Lords," said he, "you can never fully appreciate the deserts of this great man. You can appreciate the acts which he publicly performed; but you cannot appreciate, because you cannot know, the mischiefs which he unostentatiously prevented."

That observation applies remarkably to the profession to which I am referring. There are rare opportunities of performing great and distinguished public services; but there are constant opportunities of preventing quietly great mischiefs. The career of a diplomatist has nearly always to be directed to averting some impending calamity from rising to the height at which it would attract attention, and to sowing the seeds of some future advantage, the fruits of which he can rarely expect himself to see. For him the trumpet of Fame never sounds; his reputation lies buried amidst the dusty archives of some out-of-the-way office, there to rust in obscurity until the curious historian may disinter the skeleton of an intellect which will not be known to the world until the generation which felt its influence has passed into the tomb. Still, it should not be imagined, because the career of a diplomatist is noiseless, it is therefore insignificant. It has been my fortune to know many of the eminent men of my time, eminent in the senate, at the forum, in the field: I have known, also, some of the most eminent diplomatists of England and of Europe, and I venture to say that these last have been in no way inferior to the first, either in the abilities they have exhibited, or the services they have performed. I trust, then, that the profession to which I have the humble merit to belong will not be degraded from the station it has hitherto occupied in the esteem of my countrymen; and I believe that I am doing that which is most likely to prevent this result, in advocating a diminution of all unnecessary expenditure and the promotion of all improvements that can be advantageously introduced. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by thanking the Committee for the attention with which they had listened to his remarks.

Mr. OTWAY said, he understood that the hon. Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands) had purposed to allude to certain items of expenditure in the diplomatic service, and to reserve the general question of diplomacy to the Motion of which he had given notice in the ensuing Session of Parliament. He (Mr. Otway) did not, however, regret that the hon. Member had called attention to the entire subject, if for no other reason than that it had elicited so remarkable a speech from the right hon. Member for Tamworth (Sir Henry Bulwer), who had most nobly vindicated the profession of which he was an ornament. The question of diplomacy was one of efficiency or non-efficiency. If the service was not efficient, the whole sum voted was absolutely wasted. If, on the other hand, it were efficient, the sum voted was a very small sum to pay as an assurance against war and commercial disadvantages. Now he (Mr. Otway) thought that the diplomacy of this country might safely claim some credit for the successful result of recent negotiations. For example, a question had been recently agitated which might have set all Europe in a blaze. He alluded to the question of the war which threatened to take place between France and Prussia with respect to Luxemburg. Was not the diplomacy of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley)—who was then at the head of Foreign Affairs—efficient in preventing an outbreak? Last winter there was a revival of the Eastern question; and within the last few months a question had been agitated between France and Belgium, in which this country took a deep interest, and which at one time assumed a threatening aspect. It was not for him to refer particularly to this question; but he thought hon. Gentlemen would have confidence in his assurance that hereafter it would be seen that, in the opinion of those most concerned, the diplomacy of this country on both these occasions was most serviceable and friendly. Now, if our diplomacy had been efficient, and its success had been such as to prevent war and to secure commercial advantages for the country, the sum paid for it was by no means too large. He regretted very much that his hon. Friend the Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands) should have spoken of diplomatists as men who passed a life of frivolity, and were maintained by the nation in luxury. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Sir Henry Bulwer) had shown that they were not frivolous; and surely those who passed their lives amid the swamps of South America and in China were not exactly in the midst of luxury. Again, his hon. Friend the Member for Warrington, in speaking of these diplomatic charges, said that the money had been fraudulently expended. To this statement he must give a complete denial.

Mr. RYLANDS explained, that what he had said was that the accounts were so kept that they gave opportunities for fraudulent expenditure.

Mr. OTWAY said, that even that qualification was objectionable, because every shilling spent in the diplomatic service—whether extravagantly or economically—was most accurately accounted for, and audited with the greatest strictness by public officers. His hon. Friend had done injustice to the occasion which gave him the opportunity of submitting his remarks to the House, for it was on this very occasion that, in conformity with a Resolution passed by the last House of Commons, the diplomatic expenditure was for the first time submitted to the criticisms of Parliament. His hon. Friend had accused not only the noble Lord opposite, but hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House, of opposing that Resolution: but, so far from that being correct, the fact was that six Members of the present Government had voted in favour of the Motion. His hon. Friend had found fault with the great increase in the diplomatic expenditure; but the fact was that it had not increased at all. Certain items had increased; but the diplomatic expenditure, which was fixed at a certain rate when William IV. came to the Throne, remained exactly the same, though prices had increased. The demands upon those who filled diplomatic offices had increased, and the salaries of men filling corresponding positions in the diplomatic services of other countries had increased largely; and, moreover, the Committee should remember that one item had been created in the last few years—namely, that for the Consular establishments in China, Japan, and Siam, which was called for by the requirements of our trade in those countries. He did not say that in every case a consul had been appointed in China exactly where one was wanted, with such a salary as he ought to receive. During the present year one of the consulates in that country had been abolished, and he was not prepared to say that further reductions might not be effected, though they must, of course, depend to a great extent upon the state of trade. If we increased our trade, and opened new ports, it was necessary to establish consular officers of some kind to watch over our shipping interests. The idea of his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands), that the business of diplomacy ought to terminate in the consular officers, was one which could never be carried out. Consular officers were required to look after the interests of trade in the ports; and, in the event of wrong being done, to communicate with the Minister resident in the capital, who would endeavour to obtain redress from the Government of the country for any wrong that might be committed. The greatest possible evils would arise from the mixing up of the two functions—and, indeed, his right hon. Friend (Sir Henry Bulwer) had stated the opinion on this subject of a potentate who was as able as anyone in the world to form a correct judgment respecting it—the present Emperor of the French. He concurred to a considerable extent in what had fallen from his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) concerning the large increase in the item for "extraordinary expenditure." This had not escaped the attention of the Foreign Office, and he sincerely trusted they would be more successful than they had hitherto been in checking expenditure under this head. As far back as 1860 Lord Russell issued a circular on this subject, not imputing blame, but calling attention to these extraordinary expenses, and requiring the Ministers to watch them with all possible diligence. This was the policy also of the present Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and he (Mr. Otway) trusted, when his hon. Friend brought on his Motion next year, to be able to announce a considerable diminution in this item. The expense of the house at Constantinople had been greatly overstated by his hon. Friend. It must be remembered that our Ambassador there stood in the position of a great Colonial Governor. The sum included the cost of maintaining a large establishment, a hospital, and a prison; but, putting all these items together, they fell considerably short of the amount mentioned by his hon. Friend. He (Mr. Otway) admitted that he was not prepared to defend the expenditure for special missions, as it had always been a puzzle to him why the Garter or other Order could not be conferred upon a Sovereign by the Minister of this country ordinarily resident at his Court. But some great State ceremonial appeared to be thought necessary on these occasions. His hon. Friend had based the whole of his argument upon the recommendations of the Committee of 1850; but he had studiously avoided all reference to the recommendations of that which sat in 1861, which arrived at conclusions opposite, in most respects, to those of the first Committee. The former Committee wanted Legations only to be maintained; whereas the latter were in favour of constituting several additional Embassies; and the Foreign Office, not being able to decide between these contrary opinions, had adopted neither, but had pursued the even tenour of its way. With regard to the remarks of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes), he could promise that there should be a considerable reduction in the expenses for messengers as opportunity occurred; but he was unable to hold out any hope that the item for telegrams would be reduced. The very essence of diplomacy was early information; and he did not think we paid too much under that head, considering the greatness of the country and our multifarious interests. He confessed he would rather see an increase than a decrease in this item. The hon. Member for Finsbury had mentioned the other night that a private mercantile firm expended no less than £5,000 a year for obtaining telegrams; and could we then grudge the expenditure necessary for obtaining early intelligence of matters of national importance? At the same time, he admitted there ought to be a diminution of the expense for conveying despatches to the country. His hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Muntz) had made several statements which were peculiarly inaccurate. He spoke of the resident at Coburg as a gentleman who passed his life at Baden-Baden. In point of fact, that gentleman had been at Coburg ever since the Battle of Waterloo, and he maintained those relations which were not at all unnatural, considering the connection of the Royal Family of this country with the Duchy of Coburg. The sum he received for his services was so small that the hon. Gentleman would be ashamed to pay it to a principal clerk in his establishment. The hon. Gentleman also objected to the maintenance of the Legation at Dresden, on the ground that Saxony herself sent no representatives abroad. Now, Saxony did not belong to the North German Confederation.

SIR HENRY BULWER: Do you say that Saxony does not belong to the North German Confederation?

MR. OTWAY said, it certainly did not for diplomatic purposes. On a point of this kind he must be presumed to be correctly informed, and he was bound to state his own opinion. Saxony had most jealously maintained her diplomatic representatives; the French kept a Minister Plenipotentiary at Dresden, and Saxony, in return, sent her Ministers abroad, distinct from those of the North German Confederation. He did not say that there were no blots in our diplomatic system; but, at all events, his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) had hit none of them to-night. His right hon. Friend the Member for Tamworth (Sir Henry Bulwer) had, in his very able speech, alluded to the leave of absence to be granted to diplomatists, and, in his opinion, had made out a case for the alteration of the rules on this subject. Lord Clarendon informed him some time ago that the matter was under his consideration, and he hoped some arrangement would be made to bring about the result which his right hon. Friend desired. He would not go into an explanation of all the other items, because the hon. Member had given notice of his intention to bring forward the whole question of our diplomacy next Session; and, considering the length of time the diplomatic profession had existed, he thought it was not too much to ask the Committee to defer until then their decision on so wide and important a subject. This country was wealthy and powerful, and it would not like to be inadequately represented abroad. How often did they hear discontented men say, "The Lord Chancellor gets so much and the Bishop of London gets so much; I know many of my friends who would be glad to take the place of either of them for one-tenth of the salary?" That kind of thing might sound very well with regard to diplomacy, and his hon. Friend might think that a consul at £600 or £800 a year would exercise the functions of an Ambassador satisfactorily. But he (Mr. Otway) did not believe that the people of this country would be of that opinion. They required efficient service, and if they obtained it they would not grudge its proper remuneration. Looking to the wealth and power of England, and to the diplomatic establishments which other countries maintained, he did not think, in regard to many of our Embassies and missions abroad, that the sum paid to our officials was at all an extravagant sum. He hoped his hon. Friend would not now press his Motion for the reduction of £10,000 from that Vote, especially as the whole subject was to be investigated by a Committee in the ensuing Session of Parliament; for he might as well at once inform his hon. Friend that it would not be his duty to oppose the appointment of a Committee next year. He thought his hon. Friend, by his speech of that night, had amply made out a case for inquiry; and therefore, as the entire subject would be investigated next Session, he appealed to his hon. Friend not at the end of July to divide the Committee on a Motion which was after all of no specific character, which struck at no particular or definite abuse, but which sought, by a sort of rule-of-thumb principle, to cut down that Vote by £10,000—a proceeding which would produce considerable confusion in the public service. Although it might be unwise to promise too much, he frankly admitted that there were items of expenditure in the diplomatic service which would bear reduction; and he could assure his hon. Friend that it was the earnest desire of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to reduce that branch of expenditure as far as he could do so without impairing the efficiency of the service.

Mr. BRISCOE said, the Motion of the hon. Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands) did not appear to him to be intended in any sense as a party Motion, or as a censure upon Her Majesty's Government. The greater part of that hon. Member's speech referred to the Report made by a Committee of that House in 1850, and consisted of a complaint that the recommendations of that Committee had not been carried out, except, perhaps, in one single instance. Now, it had been his own lot for many months to be engaged in canvassing the large constituency of West Surrey, and during the whole of his canvass he was repeatedly asked, almost every day, whether he would support, by his vote and influence, a reduction in the public expenditure. He answered in the affirmative, and the elector who had interrogated him said—"Then, Sir, I will give you my vote." Other matters seemed to be put aside by the constituency, and all their interest to be centred in the reduction of expenditure and of taxation. He was sure that a very strong feeling on that subject prevailed among the new electors throughout the country, and there were few hon. Members who had not promised on the hustings to use their best endeavours to effect that retrenchment which the people had so much and so justly at heart. As to the general question of the necessity of our having efficient diplomatic representatives abroad, he thought that the late Foreign Secretary (Lord Stanley) had brought important negotiations to a successful issue by the wisdom, the temper, and the high personal character which he brought to bear upon them. On the other hand, the prospect of a settlement of the unhappy *Alabama* question had been injured by a want of similar wisdom and temper. So in regard to the dispute with Abyssinia, it was not the fault of a diplomatist, but of the individual having charge of the foreign affairs of this country when it first arose. In conclusion, he hoped the Motion of the hon. Member for Warrington would be allowed to pass; and he should feel it his duty to vote for it in redemption of the promise which he had given at the hustings.

Mr. WHITWELL said, he thought that after the speeches of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Henry Bulwer), it was impossible for anyone to follow the hon. Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands) into the Lobby without previously disclaiming any desire to seek by a reduction of that Vote to impair the efficiency of the representation of this country at foreign Courts. He did not believe that any injury to the public service would result even from a larger measure of economy than that shadowed forth by the hon. Member for Warrington. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Bulwer) had told them that, although he was an Ambassador, he had no power to diminish the expenditure of his Embassy. This was surely a strong argument in favour of that House exercising some control over such matters. The influence of English diplomacy in several recent cases had been spoken of; but he asked whether that influence had not been brought to bear much more through the Foreign Office in London, aided by the electric telegraph, than by our representatives abroad? and he trusted that on all future occasions the telegraph wires would be found increasingly useful in the conduct of our foreign relations. He wished to draw the attention of the Under Secretary of State to a nest of extravagant expenditure not alluded to by the hon. Member for Warrington. The right hon. Baronet had advised us to maintain the influence of those of our Ambassadors who had the interests of peace and commerce in their hands. But in the case of Persia we could not look to the diplomatic action of our Ambassador as likely to benefit our commerce, and it was to be hoped that he would not interfere too much with the foreign affairs of the Eastern part of the world. The expenditure incurred in Persia amounted to a sum that would be perfectly incredible if we did not find it in the accounts. The Ambassador himself received £5,000 a year; the secretary who assisted him £750; an Oriental secretary, £600; a second secretary, £400; and a third secretary, £250. Then his dragoman had £490, and his physician, chaplain, and organist, £600. Then for servants' wages we paid £1,417, in addition to which there was for journeys on public service £1,689, and for couriers, £1,498. In short, the various miscellaneous items made up a total of £7,892, making, with the ordinary outlay upon the Ambassador and his attendants, the sum of £14,892. Last year we spent £8,000 in building him a house; this year there would be another Vote of £8,000, so that we should spend at Teheran in one year £22,892, and next year £4,000 more would be taken for the house. He admitted the necessity for efficiency in that branch of the public service; but he believed that object could be attained with a great diminution of expenditure. Hon. Gentlemen who had been present when the expenditure of an Ambassador at Constantinople was discussed would be interested to know that an account of that discussion had already been published in that city. He held in his hand a paper containing a leading article which stated that these discussions would

> "Create no local surprise. The subject had been long a notorious one, and the fact that it had attracted attention only now was an illustration of the slowness with which abuses travel home."

The leading article to which he referred had given great credit to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Bulwer). It went on to say that the expenditure might be easily diminished by £2,000, and suggested that the Queen's messengers between this country and Constantinople should be discontinued. He should divide with the hon. Member for Warrington on the Vote.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he, for one, had listened to this debate with considerable satisfaction, because he held that the Committee was only discharging its duty in criticizing those Estimates when put before it. The object of putting these Estimates before the Committee was in order that they might stand the test of criticism. The Gentlemen who had taken part in the discussion had evidently paid great attention to the subject, and had exhibited great acuteness, as well as knowledge, of the various details, and he had no doubt that what they had said would be of great value when the Government came to frame the Estimates of next year. But he wished he could persuade hon. Gentlemen to do that which would really give the most efficient aid to the Department with which he was connected in pressing for all reasonable retrenchment in this matter. The House of Commons should by this time know its own strength, which consisted in giving very full, fair, and candid expression to the opinion of their constituents and their own, and that expression of opinion would never fail to receive due attention from Her Majesty's Government. But what he ventured to urge on the Committee, in the interest of retrenchment and reformation, was that they should be content with the excellent arguments they had used, without pressing the subject to a division. Supposing they were to carry the Amendment, what would they gain? Would they add anything to the force of the excellent reasons they had urged? Suppose they took off £10,000, what assistance would that give to the Foreign Office or the Treasury? They did not fix upon any particular item, but merely said that £10,000 should be struck off. That was not the way to add strength to the excellent debates that had occurred, by following them up, not by striking off any particular items, but by diminishing the whole Vote in a blind way. Supposing the Government were successful in resisting the Amendment, as they were bound to resist it, because it was not aimed at any particular abuse of expenditure, did they think that would add weight to the debate of that night or tend to keep down this expenditure? If they would only take his advice—and he had no other interest but to cut down the expenditure as far as possible—they would be content with the discussion and would not go to a division, which could add nothing to the strength of the arguments which had been used that night.

MR. CANDLISH said, the right hon. Gentleman had told them that they had not pointed out where any reduction could be effected; but what had the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for

Foreign Affairs said? He said he knew there were blots in the Estimates. It was perfectly clear, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman himself was acquainted with the nature of those blots. But if that were so the most effectual means of inducing the hon. Gentleman to turn his knowledge to practical account and to correct the abuses of which he was aware would be to reduce the Vote. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer asked, what good would they do if they carried this reduction? In the first place, they would save the country £10,000, because he was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman would not emulate his predecessors and spend money without Parliamentary sanction, but would limit his expenditure to what Parliament should grant. In the next place, they would show the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they were in close alliance with him in keeping down outlay, and he really expected that if they pressed the matter to a division the right hon. Gentleman would vote with his hon. Friend the Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands). It was said that a Committee would be appointed next year; but the Estimates next year would be precisely the same as this year, unless some action was taken by the Executive Government. If they were to wait for the action of the Committee, it was perfectly clear they would have to wait for two years. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs had said that he would wait the decision of the Committee, and would be prepared to act on their recommendation. The best thing for them to do was to give up the Committee and take the matter into their own hands. They did not seek to embarrass the Government, which had obtained loyal support from that side of the House, but they had a duty to their constituents to perform, and he hoped they would not shrink from it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) stated he was sure the Government would not spend money for which they had no Parliamentary sanction. Assuredly he would be no party to any such proceeding. That was precisely the fault the Government found with this Motion; they did not know which of those items it was from which Parliamentary sanction was withdrawn. If the Committee only fixed on any particular item, that would help the Government. All the Committee did was to say "We fix the estimate of this expenditure at £10,000 lower, and we leave it to you to manage it as you can." That was precisely the difficulty of the Government.

MR. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, he hoped the hon. Member who had moved the reduction of the Vote (Mr. Rylands) would persevere. He had listened with great interest to a discussion which would enable the country to see who were for reform and who were not. He must protest against the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had told them that the best thing they could do was to leave their arguments to speak for themselves, but not to go to a division. He had not been long in the House; but he knew that speeches without votes were of very little value. Ministers had been in the habit of going about the country making speeches in favour of retrenchment, and had actually complained that the House would not support an economical Government. Now, Ministers asked them to talk and not to divide; but he hoped a division would be taken, so as to show the country that they entertained a disposition of reducing the expenditure of the country.

MR. FIELDEN observed, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them they were not entitled to strike off £10,000 without describing the items it was intended to reduce; but the gross sum only was before the Committee, and not the particular items. Chancellors of the Exchequer always professed to be in favour of retrenchment and economy, and the House of Commons ought to show that they were bent upon the reduction of the public expenditure. He hoped the Amendment would be pressed to a division.

MR. MUNTZ, in justice to our representative at Coburg, was bound to say he did not remember seeing him at Baden-Baden; he merely mentioned Baden-Baden as a place where those connected with our Continental Embassies resorted.

MR. OTWAY said, he wished to correct a misapprehension which had arisen. He had not said that he could put his finger upon blots, but that there were certain items that could be reduced, and that if the House would allow the Government to consider these matters some of them should be reduced. His promise was, that in consequence of the discussion which had taken place it would be his duty to represent to the Secretary of State what the opinion of the House was. The Government would carefully consider all the items of expenditure with a desire to promote economy. He asked his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) to have some consideration for the public service, and not roughly to strike off £10,000 from the expenditure of a year seven months of which had already passed. If, next year, in the face of the assurances he and his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given, the same Estimate was offered to the House, he would be, indeed, open to the reproach his hon. Friend passed upon him.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he did not agree with the conclusions of the hon. Member for Warrington (Mr. Rylands); but he felt considerable sympathy with him in his endeavour to effect some reduction in the cost of the public service. Undoubtedly the hon. Member had good reason for expecting some reduction in this and other Votes by the present Government, because hon. Members could not have forgotten the charges brought by Ministers, when in the country, against the late Government. The Prime Minister, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and others had spoken of extravagance in the Civil Service, and yet the Government had brought up Estimates which proposed an increase upon the charge for the Civil Service of last year. He believed the charge for the Civil Service would increase as it had increased, because, as he had the opportunity of showing last year, the requirements of the public increased. The present Ministers, when before the country, propounded the theory that increase in one Department should be met by more stringent economy in another, and, with a view to give them an opportunity of acting upon their theory, the late Government left the framing of the Civil Service Estimates entirely to them. He was not very sanguine on the subject; but, at the same time, hon. Members opposite were quite justified in holding the Government to their pledges, and he hoped they would do so.

MR. RYLANDS said, he did not press his Motion from any doubt as to the good intentions of the Government. He did not see that a division could affect the public service in any way, for he had pointed out that the amount by which he proposed to reduce the Estimates could be saved by a reduction in the charge for special services and general extraordinary expenses.

SIR HENRY BULWER said, he thought the charge for the Consular service might undergo a reduction, but that the reduction now proposed was an indefinite one, and it was not clear how that reduction was to be made. He wished to know whether it was not possible to propose an Amendment pledging the Government to make a reduction to the amount that had been named—to a declaration that reform and reduction were necessary in the diplomatic service? That would cover the object of the hon. Gentleman. If that could not be done, he did not see how he could vote against the proposed reduction.

MR. OTWAY, presuming from what the hon. Member for Warrington had said, that he desired to prevent confusion in the public service, but, at the same time, to establish that the House desired economy, would make a proposition to him. Meeting his hon. Friend in the spirit he professed, and without retracting anything he had said with respect to the preparation of the Estimates for next year, he would offer to consent to a reduction of £2,000 on account of the special missions for this year.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 66; Noes 66.

MR. DODSON (Chairman of the Committee) said, the Committee having hesitated to affirm the proposed reduction of the Vote, as submitted to it on the responsibility of the Executive Government, and as, if the proposed reduction be negatived, the Committee would have an opportunity of voting upon any other reduction of the whole Vote which may be moved, he declared himself with the Noes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that if it were intended to discontinue the chaplain at Paris, the item of £300 ought to be struck out.

MR. OTWAY said, the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary had assured the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) that the vacancy should not be filled up without communicating with him; but, as the item stood on the Estimates, it had been re-printed. There was not the slightest intention to make any appointment, and, of course, the money would be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH again urged that the item ought to be omitted, and commented upon the extraordinary arrangement said to have been made between the Foreign Secretary and a private Member.

Mr. OTWAY, gratified by the exhibition of new-born zeal for economy, explained that the hon. Member for Perth was well known for his opposition to the appointment of a chaplain at Paris. When the vacancy occurred last his hon. Friend communicated with the Foreign Secretary, who said he would not make an appointment until the House of Commons had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject. It was not intended to make any appointment; but, at the same time, he would not say that under no circumstances or conditions would it ever be necessary to appoint another chaplain. Therefore, the money stood in the Estimates as it always had done; but no appointment would be made without consulting the House, and, of course, the money would be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. SCLATER - BOOTH reminded the hon. Gentleman that if he had not voted with him in the division which had just been taken, he would have been in a minority. He must also remind him that the Estimate now under the consideration of the Committee had never been submitted to the late Board of Treasury, and that it had been stated in the most distinct manner by an hon. Gentleman opposite that he had been informed by the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs that it was not his intention to fill up the appointment in question. That being so, the item itself ought, in accordance with the usual mode of proceeding, to have been struck out of the Estimate. He last year had done so on more than one occasion when he found that items were not required for the public service. It was said that the appointment of chaplain would not be made until the House of Commons had an opportunity of expressing an opinion with respect to it; but the Committee would be expressing an opinion upon the point if they were to agree that the item for the salary should stand part of the Vote.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, that when the noble Lord the Colleague of the hon. Gentleman was in Office he had represented to him all the facts of the case, and that he concurred with him in the opinion that the appointment ought to be done away with. The item had, nevertheless, been retained in the Estimates. He did not pretend, however, to have confidence in hon. Gentlemen opposite; but, having full confidence in the present Administration, he had no objection to leave the matter in the hands of the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, he thought that, it being agreed on all hands that the chaplaincy at Paris should be disestablished and disendowed, the common sense mode of proceeding would be that the item for it should be withdrawn from the Estimates.

Mr. OTWAY agreed to allow the item to be struck out.

(36.) Motion made, and Question,

"That a sum, not exceeding £155,367, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Missions and Embassies Abroad,"—(*Mr. Otway,*)

—put, and *agreed to.*

(37.) £174,451, to complete the sum for Consular Services.

Mr. BOWRING called attention to the Consulate of Chicago. He said that Chicago was the centre of a large and important district of the United States, embracing Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, in which immense quantities of wheat, flour, and Indian corn were produced. So far from abolishing such an office as this at Chicago, the Government ought to take steps to make the trade of the district more important to British commercial interests. He ventured to suggest that Chicago should be made a Consulate General for all the great Western States.

Mr. OTWAY said, it was the intention of Government to abolish the Consulate at Chicago. The hon. Member wished the consulate to be retained; but a Committee of the House of Commons had decided to the contrary. The Committee of 1859 recommended that the consulates of Elsinore, Chicago, and Buffalo, should be abolished, and Government was now carrying out the recommendation in the case of Chicago.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH asked if it was intended to abolish the Consulate at Chicago at once, or wait until it was vacant? If the latter, he thought the announcement was premature.

MR. OTWAY said, there would be no re-appointment at the three places he had mentioned.

MR. MUNTZ, referring to the appointment of a Minister Plenipotentiary at Hamburg, maintained that there was no necessity for continuing it now that Hamburg had become part of the North German Confederation. That we should have a consul there was, in his opinion, all that was required.

MR. R. SHAW said, he must protest against the magnitude of the Vote. It was true that the Government had reduced it from the amount at which it stood last year by £13,342, and he thanked them for that reduction; but unless some more material reduction were made next year, they must be prepared to meet a determined opposition upon this branch of expenditure. The Vote had considerably and steadily increased of late years. In 1834-5 it was £95,486; in 1858-9, it reached £187,527; and now, in 1869-70, it was £261,451. The Select Committee of 1858 appeared to have acted solely in the interests of the consuls, and to have ignored the interests of the British taxpayer. The Committee made a great mistake in two respects. First, with regard to the classification of consuls, which meant £500 or £600 a year more to certain consulates for the same amount of work; and the second mistake was recommending the payment of consuls by salaries instead of by fees, which were now paid into the Exchequer. From 1858 to 1869 the excess of charge was £74,000 per annum, whilst the fees paid into the Exchequer since that time amounted only to the paltry and insignificant sum of £17,888. The consul of Buenos Ayres had a salary of £1,000 per annum, and £400 per annum for incidental expenses, and he (Mr. Shaw) wished to know why £100 a year more was to be given to the consul for incidental expenses? The consul there ought to give the country the whole of his services for the salary he received; but it was reported that that gentleman, in addition, had recently been appointed a post office agent and a managing director of a railway. He also wished to know why it was proposed to increase the consul's salary at Rosario £200 per annum?

MR. OTWAY said, that no doubt the whole of the service would be inquired into next Session. When Mr. Pariah, who was now at Buenos Ayres, was transferred there from China, his fees averaged £1,400 per annum. When he went to Buenos Ayres it was determined that the consul's salary should be £900 per annum, with £400 per annum for incidental expenses, and so Mr. Pariah would have lost £100 per annum, but it was proposed to give him this additional £100 per annum to make it up. The addition to the consul's salary at Rosario was rendered necessary owing to the high price of provisions and other circumstances.

MR. MONK wished to know who received the fees paid at Constantinople?

Vote *agreed to.*

(38.) £46,298, to complete the sum for Colonies, Grants in Aid.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, he wished to have some explanation on certain points in connection with these Estimates, which he believed would be useful and interesting to the Committee. He had no objection to make to them. The items were steadily diminishing, and he hoped soon they would cease to appear on the Estimates altogether. In fact, the greater part of these charges were expiring, merely retained during the lives of certain possessors—the clergy of North America, West India Justices, and Pensioners. The charges on this Treasury for salaries of three Colonial Governors were on the point of expiry. The Bahamas Legislature lately attempted to withhold their contribution of salary to their Governor, but they thought better of it, and had agreed to continue it. The colony of Prince Edward's Island were about to pay their own Governor, and West Australia a considerable portion of the salary of theirs. The net decrease in the Colonial Estimates of this year was about £6,000; and that decrease arose in this way. Labuan, for the first time, had ceased to be a charge upon the English Treasury. The Governor, lately a Member of that House, Mr. Pope Hennessy, had written to him expressing just pride in having, within so short a time as two years, taken off this charge. That colony had, since its first establishment, thrown an average charge of £4,800 a year on the Imperial Treasury, which the Governor had now succeeded in removing altogether. He (Sir Charles Adderley) confessed he had from the first doubted very much the use of establishing a government at all at Labuan; but he would not revert to the causes which had induced this country to assume that settlement. We had objects in view connected with humanity and missionary enterprise, but there was really no commercial value in the colony except from its coal mine, and upon this point he wished to know whether the coal company was more flourishing than it had been, and whether the Admiralty had found that they could use this coal for ships upon the Eastern stations, instead of having to send to Wales to bring coals to Labuan? The next principal item of decrease was no decrease of annual expenditure at all, the two sums which had disappeared this year being £3,000 given last year, as a present to St. Helena, and the same amount to the Virgin Islands, in consideration of the ravages committed, in the one case by white ants, and in the other by the dreadful hurricane which occurred there. The principal item of increase required some explanation—it was connected with West Africa. When it was understood that the Government no longer intended to blockade that coast against the slave trade, it became a question for the consideration of Parliament how long they should continue the expenditure in our four settlements on that coast. Lagos, which had been expensive, this year ceased to be a charge on the Treasury. Gambia was still a charge, and the Gold Coast was a still larger one. The whole expenditure on the West Coast had increased this year by the item of the cost of a steamer. That item had, however, been incurred with the view to a diminution of general expenditure by consolidating all these governorships and giving the one Governor of Sierra Leone a steamer to visit his three subalterns. In 1866, a sum was voted for this steamer, and they now found another Vote for the same purpose. This required explanation. For the Gold Coast there was still a charge of £2,000. The diminution from £4,500 to £2,000, he presumed they would be told, had been the result of an exchange of forts with the Dutch. If that was so, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for the Colonies would be able to tell them that it had been successfully carried out. With regard also to Gambia, some explanation was required. Looking at the Estimates, it was found that the Committee were asked to Vote £1,500 in aid of the local Government of that country; but he found that whilst the local expenditure of Gambia was £18,664, the revenue was £21,642, and yet, in spite of the revenue being greater than the expenditure, they were asked to vote the sum in aid which he had mentioned. This should be explained. He might also ask whether negotiations were still going on with France for transferring the Gambia to them? France seemed anxious, by some exchange with us, to become possessed of the Gambia for the purpose of extending their western settlement of Africa. It appeared to him such an arrangement might be equally advantageous to this country. If our sole object in placing ourselves on the West Coast was to blockade it against the slave trade, and the slave trade had now ceased, he could conceive no objection to the French taking a station off our hands, which, if necessary, they could blockade again as well as ourselves; and as the trade of Gambia was now entirely French,. we should not suffer in any mercantile interest by the exchange. One other point upon which he wished for explanation. He was anxious to know whether the Government intended to carry out a plan which the late Government had in contemplation for the consolidation of the West Indian Governments? There was nothing more important in regard to the economical and efficient government of these colonies. At present every island had its own Governor, or Lieutenant Governor, Legislature, and civil, judicial, and ecclesiastical establishments. The salaries of all these officials, while they exhausted the revenues of the colonies, were often not sufficient to command the services of competent men. Many of those Islands were not as big as an ordinary English squire's estate, the revenues in some cases amounting to only £5,000 a year, The expenditure under different heads was ridiculous. In one island there was, he recollected, an expenditure of £32 10*s*. 1½*d*. for the year's public works. So small an expenditure, with such a Government staff to manage it, was of itself an absurdity and a source of inefficiency. As the first step towards this union the present Secretary at War (Mr. Cardwell) had united together the Islands of Nevis and St. Kitts, and had asked his successor why he had not annexed Montserrat to them. The late Government undertook to carry out the idea on a much larger scale, and had contemplated the union of the Leeward Islands and the Windward Islands under one Governor. Without any greater expenditure, a salary of the first class could be obtained for such a Governor, and the Chief Justice, and Judges of these islands, could be grouped in a consolidated circuit. Legislators of a higher class would also be elected, who would be better adapted to carry out representative institutions in the colonies. The noble Lord the Secretary for the Colonies might not have found it possible to carry out the full plan of the late Government; but he should like to know what he proposed to do with regard to the Executive and the Legislative consolidation of the West India Islands? Perhaps he would also state the intentions of the Government in regard to the small island of Heligoland. It was now a charge upon the Treasury, the island drawing from gambling-houses a small revenue, which, however, was in process of extinction. The late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Duke of Buckingham), wishing to form his own opinion, paid a personal visit to the island—the first Secretary of State for the Colonies, perhaps, who was ever there. His noble Friend thought the island might be made of some use as an out coastguard station, and useful both for the protection and control of the English fishermen who resorted to it, while the presence even of one cutter would strengthen the hands of the Governor. It had since been made a coastguard station. He wanted to know whether that arrangement had proved successful and useful? He wished also to be informed whether, *pari passu* with the reduction of the civil expenditure, there had been a reduction of the military expenditure of the colonies? The late Government made attempts in several quarters to reduce this charge. They drew away a considerable number of troops from Canada, and would have withdrawn more, but for the threatening attitude of the Fenians in the United States. They also instituted a gradual process of withdrawing English troops from South Africa, and had reduced the garrisons of the West Indies, the West Coast of Africa, and elsewhere. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would be able to inform them that these reductions were being carried out on a still larger scale.

COLONEL SYKES observed with pleasure that the naval force on the West Coast of Africa had been considerably reduced by the present First Lord, but seven vessels still remained there, and the saving seemed to have been swallowed up by an item of £10,000 for a steamer at Sierra Leone. He asked for an explanation in regard to the grant of £1,500 for Gambia, although it appeared that the revenue was £21,642, and the expenditure £18,664. On the Gold Coast he observed that the revenue was £8,146, and the expenditure £10,993.

MR. WINTERBOTHAM asked for information respecting the Bishops that were travelling over those islands at the public expense.

MR. MONSELL said, in reply to the last question, that he thought he could promise a considerable reduction of expenditure on that head. With regard to the steamer at Sierra Leone, when the whole of the coast of West Africa was placed under a governor in chief, it was thought necessary that he should have the means of rapid communication with all the British Settlements on the coast. There was a steamer which had been purchased at considerable expense; but it having been found to draw too much water, it was considered necessary either to alter her, or to place another steamer there in her stead. It would have cost £8,400 to alter her and adapt her to the station, and it was thought that as a new steamer could be purchased for £15,000, it would be better to spend £11,000 upon a new and good article, than £9,000 upon an old and inefficient one. If this expenditure were put aside, there was a considerable reduction in the Estimates for the West Coast. With regard to the military colonial expenditure, the reductions effected by the present Government amounted to £700,000 a year, and there would be a still further reduction in the next year from the steps which the Government were now taking. With respect to the naval expenditure, there had been a considerable reduction on the West Coast of Africa. He could corroborate what the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles Adderley) had stated in regard to the entire success of Mr. Pope Hennessy in the Government of Labuan. By his energy and good sense he had been able to develop those coal mines, which were so important for the future prosperity of Labuan. He had effected this through getting convicts from the Straits Settlements and employing them in the coal mines. The result had been that coal had been produced in considerable quantities; and, although it did not equal the coal of this country, it had been used in Her Majesty's ships, and had been found fitted for use in steamers. The Gambia Vote of £1,500 was owing to the failure of commerce during the last year and a fearful outbreak of cholera. It was feared that from these causes the revenue would fall off; but if it did not, the money would not be required, and, of course, would not be spent. The arrangement between the English and Dutch Governments had produced satisfactory commercial results. As regarded the political results, however, he could not speak so confidently, for the tribes that had always owed allegiance to England very much disliked the transfer to the Dutch Government. He had not understood that it was the object of the Duke of Buckingham merely to establish a coastguard station at Heligoland. He had been under the impression that the people of that island were rather backward in paying their taxes, and certainly the presence of five or six coastguard men had, in that respect, been attended with the happiest effect. The partial consolidation of the Windward and Leeward Islands had not been carried out according to the plan of the late Government. The course pursued had been to separate the Windward from the Leeward Islands, one class being exclusively colonies where the authority of the Crown was predominant, and therefore, more easily dealt with; and the Governor who had the most experience in these islands, Sir Benjamin Pine, was sent to Antigua with instructions to consolidate the five islands under his jurisdiction, and place them absolutely under one government. Among the advantages of this scheme would be the disappearance of a vast number of useless officers—treasurers, Judges, and magistrates—of whom there was a complete staff for each island, the endeavour being to make those islands one, in the same sense as Orkney and Shetland were one. They would have means of communication by steamers; the whole of these islands were, he believed, likely to be connected by electric telegraph, and the House would remember that four of these islands lay within an area not so large as the county of Norfolk.

An hon. MEMBER asked why the Australian Governors, whose salaries for the most part were paid by the colonies, had their passage money home allowed by the British Government, in some cases to the extent of £800, which must far exceed the cost?

MR. GOURLEY asked for some further explanation respecting the steamer which had been spoken of, and hoped that the sum paid on her account would not be in excess of her value, as in a former case.

MR. MONSELL said, he believed the steamer was purchased upon the opinion of the Constructor of the Navy. As to the passage money of the Colonial Governors, these were all regulated according to a fixed scale, which he believed was not too high.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, the purchase of the steamer to which the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Gourley) had referred was not made by the late Government.

MR. CHILDERS said, it had not been made by the Admiralty at all.

Vote *agreed to.*

(39.) £3,134, to complete the sum for Orange River Territory and St. Helena.

(40.) £5,360, to complete the sum for Slave Trade, Commissions for Suppression of.

(41.) £23,343, to complete the sum for Tonnage Bounties, &c.

MR. MUNTZ said, it was a curious thing to vote away thousands in bounties for the capture of slaves, when the slave squadron had been withdrawn.

MR. MONSELL said, that no doubt by that time a reduction would have been made.

COLONEL SYKES said, that operations had now ceased on the West Coast of Africa, and therefore they were only dealing with the East. What really happened was something of this kind. An Arab dhow was seen in the distance by one of our cruizers, and was chased and run on shore. She was of course deserted; but whether there were slaves in her or not the bounty was equally claimed. There ought really to be a Return of the number of dhows captured in this way, and the circumstances relating to each.

MR. AYRTON observed that this information was contained on page 314 of the Estimates. Forty-six vessels were captured in 1868, of which thirty-one had slaves on board. In all, 742 slaves were liberated. The payment of these bounties was a matter regulated by Act of Parliament; and, as long as the Act remained, it would be necessary to vote the money requisite to comply with its provisions.

COLONEL SYKES observed that only £14,000 appeared to be applicable to tonnage bounties, whereas the Vote asked for £35,000.

MR. AYRTON said, the balance was for the support of the captured negroes and other charges.

MR. OTWAY said, the hon. and gallant Member would be glad to hear that the Vote was a diminishing one. The slave trade had been entirely suppressed on the West Coast of Africa, and only existed on the Eastern Coast of Africa, and the Government were in hopes that it would be suppressed there also. Great difficulty was experienced in adjudication on the slave dhows because of the defects in the papers of most Arab vessels.

Vote *agreed to.*

(42.) £9,500, to complete the sum for Emigration.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, that the Emigration officers, who were stationed at the various ports for the purpose of inspecting emigrant ships, were most useful public servants; but he thought that of the two Commissioners one might be taken into the new Colonial Office.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he thought the sum required for the purposes of the Emigration Board was a very large one, and that it might well be reduced. Their occupation, owing to the arrangements of the Colonial Governments, was now all but gone.

MR. MONSELL said, the reduction which would be made if the Emigration Board were abolished would be £2,000 per annum, making allowance for the expenses of superannuation. Arrangements had been made under which the staff of the Emigration Office would be received into the new Colonial Office, and thus the expenses of superannuation would be saved. More meritorious public officers than the two gentlemen now at the head of the Emigration department could not be found in the public service, and the best thing that could be done was to utilize their services by taking them into the Colonial Office instead of superannuating them.

Vote *agreed to.*

(43.) £500, to complete the sum for Coolie Emigration.

(44.) £9,047, to complete the sum for Treasury Chest.

(45.) £171,877, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.

MR. BOWRING said, that by the Superannuation Act of 1859 the Treasury were given power to award special allowances under exceptional circumstances; but, in order to prevent those allowances from being improperly granted, it was enacted that they should be made by special Minute to be laid before Parliament. Those Minutes had never been printed for the use of hon. Members. He thought it very desirable that special Treasury Minutes under which pensions were granted should be brought under the notice of the House.

MR. AYRTON said, that necessarily this list had been made up some time ago. The names of pensioners should be put in the list annually until their death was certified to the Department in the usual way. Grants of new pensions were set out in such a way that hon. Members could satisfy themselves as to the transactions of the year. It had not been the custom to print and circulate Treasury Minutes; but they were placed in the Library, where Members could see them.

MR. WHITWELL said, he believed that some gentlemen who were receiving salaries were also in receipt of a pension of £1,000 a year. At the present moment superannuation allowances amounting in all to £2,100 a year were paid by the Science and Art Department, and he believed that some of the recipients were men of middle age or even younger. He hoped the time was coming when Government officers would receive such salaries as would enable them to provide their own superannuation allowances.

MR. AYRTON said, he could assure his hon. Friend that this list distressed the Government as much as it could distress him. Some gentlemen who retired from the Civil Service in consequence of ill health enjoyed remarkable longevity. The list contained a record of what had been going on for the last forty years. The subject had received, and was receiving, the attention of the Government, and he thought a plan would be matured which would give more satisfaction than the one which had hitherto prevailed.

Vote *agreed to.*

(46.) £31,600, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.

(47.) £30,400, to complete the sum for Relief of Distressed British Seamen.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, it would be desirable to have a statement as to how the Vote was expended.

MR. GRAVES said, he had received numerous complaints on the subject of this Vote. In 1855 it was £8,000, in 1860 it was £19,000, in 1865 it was £30,000, and in the present year it was £45,000. With the increase of the Vote there was an increase of the evils which it covered. It was generally supposed that the money was for bringing home distressed British seamen. If it were confined to that object no one would object to it; but it was because much of it was applied to a very different purpose he felt it his duty to call attention to it. It was the habit of deserters to throw themselves on the fund provided by this Vote, and to get themselves brought home. When on board they were the worst of the ship's company. They came on board with an exhausted constitution, and on their arrival in this country they were generally afflicted with scurvy. The House had been told very often of the increase of scurvy on board ship. This was to be attributed very much to the operation of the Vote now under discussion. He had received several letters on the subject from sea captains. In one of those letters the writer stated that at Calcutta he was requested to bring home twelve distressed seamen, at 1*s.* a month each for their passage and 1*s.* a day each for their diet. He remonstrated, but ultimately he was compelled to take five, of whom three turned out to be foreigners. None of them were seamen, and but for the crew he would have had very great trouble with these men. Another captain wrote to say that he had been compelled to bring home a number of fellows who were called "distressed seamen," but among whom were two soldiers branded as deserters, a blacksmith, and persons of other callings than that of a seaman. The writer added that greater blackguards had never been aboard ship. Another captain wrote to say that of four distressed seamen whom he had been forced to carry home one was an American and another a Dutchman. One was by trade a saddler, and the other had been a stoker on a railway. This stoker confided £40 or £50 to the care of the captain, who was obliged to carry him home at 1*s.* a month and 1*s.* a day, this payment being made out of the Parliamentary Vote. He had received a memorial from a new steamship company which had a line of steamers from the West Coast of South America. The company objected to carrying those distressed seamen, who took up the room of passengers who would pay £30 or £40. He thought that the Committee would see that this Vote led to gross abuses. A clause in the memorial he had presented stated that the remuneration allowed to the company for this service was quite inadequate; that the number of seamen conveyed was rapidly increasing; and that the conveyance of such persons was a great embarrassment to the proper conduct of the service, and demoralizing to the company's carefully selected crew. It was added that such a state of things was never contemplated by the Legislature, and the memorialists asked that measures might be adopted to relieve them. He called attention to the matter, not with the view of moving the reduction of the Vote, but to suggest that some remedy should be provided in the Merchant Shipping Consolidation Bill, brought in at the close of the Session.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, this charge arose entirely under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, and the Board of Trade had little or no control over it. The men were sent home by the consuls abroad, who paid their fares, and sent their accounts to the Board of Trade. The Merchant Shipping Act provided that when men were left behind at foreign seaports, from any cause, even though it were their own fault, and were found destitute there, the consuls were to relieve them and pay their expenses home. He dared say that some abuses had occurred and in some cases men had been sent home improperly; but carefully drawn instructions had been sent to the consuls, who were requested not to send home any but those who were strictly provided for by the Act. As a general rule the consuls were very careful; but, as the hon. Member had pointed out, the Vote had been growing. The Vote, however, was rather in excess of the expenditure, which in 1866 was £49,000; in 1867, £38,000; and in 1868, £34,000. Therefore, the Committee would see that some vigilance had been exercised of late, and the actual expenditure was on the decrease. Since he had been at the Board of Trade he had endeavoured to curtail the expenditure by intimating through the Colonial Office to the colonies that they would have to bear the charges made on account of colonial sailors, which formed a not inconsiderable portion of the whole expenditure. The matter was a fit one for discussion on the Merchant Shipping Bill, which he should have to lay on the table in a day or two.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought the explanation showed that the Estimate was rather of a loose character, for it appeared that the expenditure, which was being diminished, was much less than than the Estimate; and he should have thought that the best means of controlling the expenditure would have been to have reduced the Estimate.

MR. AYRTON said, the hon. Gentleman was under a mistake. The Estimate of 1868 was exceeded by the expenditure, and the Estimate for this year was the same as that of last year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(48.) £27,320, to complete the sum for Non-conforming Clergy.

MR. MONK assumed that this Vote would cease after the present year; but he saw an item of £280 put down for a new congregation, and he thought that ought to be explained.

MR. AYRTON said, he hoped the Committee was not about to enter into a discussion of this Vote, as this was the last time it would appear on the Estimates. He could assure his hon. Friend that all the payments would be made in strict accordance with the law.

Vote *agreed to.*

(49.) £13,045, to complete the sum for Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland.

(50.) £4,825, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c. Great Britain.

(51.) £4,834, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c. Ireland.

(52.) £31,000, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions.

MR. WHITWELL asked whether the Coal Commission had closed its inquiry?

MR. AYRTON said, it had not; and that payments on account of it would continue during the current year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(53.) £31,147, to complete the sum for Local Dues on Shipping.

(54.) £380, to complete the sum for Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c.

(55.) £2,000, to complete the sum for Flax Cultivation (Ireland).

MR. CAMPBELL said, that the Vote was a mistake in itself, and did more harm than good. There was prosperity in the North of Ireland, where it was notorious that the flax trade flourished more than it did in almost any other portion of the kingdom. In 1865, an assurance was given that that would be the last Vote taken; but, nevertheless, it was continued, and he thought that now it should come to an end.

MR. AYRTON said, that Votes of this kind were given very much on the principle of compensation—one for England, another for Scotland, a third for Ireland; and it was not possible to abolish such a Vote suddenly. Last year £4,000 was granted, and it was now reduced to £3,000, with a view to the gradual suppression of the grant.

MR. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, the Vote seemed to be quite contrary to the principle of Free Trade, and wished to know whether there was any similar Vote in England or in Scotland?

Mr. AYRTON referred to the Vote for Schools of Naval Architecture in England as one of a similar kind to that in Ireland for architectural instruction.

Mr. COLLINS said, he thought the Vote should be disallowed. He believed that the people of Ireland did not require to be taught to grow flax any more than the people of England required to be taught to grow wheat.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, whatever the Committee might think of the Vote in the abstract, and for the future, he trusted they would not throw it over for the present year. A number of flax instructors were engaged in various parts of Ireland in instructing the small farmers in the cultivation of flax; and as the object had been considered one of great utility, he trusted that it would not be so suddenly put an end to.

Mr. ACLAND reminded hon. Members who represented large towns in England that a great deal of public money was spent in technical education—that was to say, in teaching persons how to manufacture in the most economical and efficient manner, and this Vote belonged to the same class.

Mr. MONK said, that £1,000 had been voted on account, and that was enough, because attempts had been made for some years past to abolish the Vote altogether.

Mr. SHERLOCK said, that Irish Members had not complained of the expenditure on the London parks, or for technical instruction; and it was not right, therefore, to object to a Vote which was for the promotion of flax cultivation chiefly in the South and West of Ireland—an object of immense national importance.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE said, he hoped that no reduction would be made in the Vote, the object of which was to promote the production of the raw material of manufacture, and thus benefit farmers, manufacturers, and the whole community. The Government had been reducing the Vote gradually, and he had no doubt that it would very soon cease.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would not enter into the question whether it was the business of the Government to teach every man his trade; but he would undertake, on the part of the Government, to put an end to the Vote as soon as they could do so, consistently with good faith towards those employed.

Vote *agreed to.*

(56.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £23,247, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for certain Miscellaneous Expenses.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he intended to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £3,374 14*s*., put down for the cost of presents and gratuities given away by his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh at the Cape and Australia, and during his present voyage in Her Majesty's ship *Galatea*. He should ask the Government, firstly, on what authority the Duke spent this money; secondly, whether any limit to the expenditure was laid down; and, thirdly, whether there was not a custom that if a Prince gave presents which the country paid for he should hand over to the country the presents he received in return? He objected not so much to the amount of this Vote as to the principle it involved. To those who might urge the smallness of the amount, he would remark that sometimes the smallness of the sum only showed the melancholy value of a transaction. It was hoped that a great effect would be produced in Australia by the visit of the Duke of Edinburgh; that the loyalty of that colony would be developed; and that it would be united in closer bonds with this country. The colony came forward with magnificent generosity to entertain the Duke, and received those presents from him. But what was the news which had lately been received from Australia? Directly it was known that the English tax-payers would have to pay this sum of money all the good which had been produced by the Duke's visit was undone. According to a telegram which appeared in every public journal in London last Monday week—

"Intense indignation prevails throughout the colony at the prospect of English tax-payers being called upon to pay for the presents which the colonists thought were private gifts from the Duke of Edinburgh."

There was another item in this Vote to which he particularly objected—that of £68 for the conveyance of Prince Christian and the Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz between Dover and Calais. But however small the amount is itself, it involved a principle by no means so insignificant. Who, he would ask, authorized Prince Christian and the Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz to entail this outlay upon the country? Then, contrast these sums with some of the miserable, paltry, and undignified items in the Estimate. There was, for example, the cost of a present to a King, who bore the honoured name of Peter, for doing an act of Christian charity by taking care of the European cemetery at River Congo. The cost of this gift was 12*s.* 8*d.* What present befitting a King could the Government have procured for 12*s.* 8*d.*? Was it an old dress coat, or a cast-off theatrical suit? Then there was the sum of £13 charged for a lunch to Prince William of Hesse. Such items as these ought never, in his opinion, to be put in the Estimates. In close contiguity to this last-named sum there was an item for providing food for the inhabitants of Cephalonia at a time when that island had been sadly injured by an earthquake. The magnificent sum devoted by the nation to this subject was £10, or £3 less than was thought necessary to provide Prince William of Hesse with a lunch. The Estimates were full of paltry and ridiculous items of this kind. For instance, there was one of £2 1*s.* for rigging out a pier at Antwerp for the reception of the Prince of Wales. He thought that the sooner items of this kind were omitted from the Vote the better. By moving the reduction of the Vote he should give the Committee an opportunity of expressing their opinion that this money ought not to have been spent without authority from the Government; and, as far as the presents of the Duke of Edinburgh were concerned, he desired to let our Australian colonists know that there were some Members in that House who shared in the indignation they justly felt. In conclusion the hon. Gentleman moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £3,442 14*s.*

Motion made, and Question,

"That a sum, not exceeding £19,804 6*s.*, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1870, for certain Miscellaneous Expenses,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)

MR. AYRTON said, it would be his duty to explain to the Committee the exact nature of this transaction, which he thought had not been very clearly understood by his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton. The Committee was doubtless aware that a certain sum was placed at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government for the purpose of meeting the small payments which it was necessary to make in administering the affairs of so great a nation as ours, and which were not provided for in the Estimates voted for the year. Out of that sum it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to make such disbursements as they might find absolutely necessary, and the practice had been to bring those disbursements under the notice of the Committee of Supply in the form of a Vote, as they were here stated, in re-payment of the Civil Contingencies Fund. That was to say, Her Majesty's Government had authority to spend the money within the year, and then in the ensuing year they brought forward an account of the expenditure. A sum was voted to replace the money so spent, and the fund again remained at their disposal. Hon. Members would perceive that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government, in accordance with the wishes expressed in former Committees of Supply, to render a minute account of the expenditure of this money, in order that the Government might be prevented from using the Civil Contingencies Fund for purposes which would not bear discussion. It was no fault of theirs that these items were very small. However provident any Minister might be, it was impossible that they could foresee every item of expenditure that would have to be incurred during the year in carrying on the affairs of the nation. When the Duke of Edinburgh was about to start upon the journey referred to in the Vote, there was a communication between His Royal Highness and the Government of the day, and it was with the deliberate judgment of the late Administration, having regard to the definite allowance made to him by Parliament, and also to the fact that he was going abroad, not for his private amusement merely, but invested with a public character to fulfil a public mission, that he should be provided with the means to carry out the objects for which it might almost be said he was dispatched by Her Majesty's Government on his journey. Her Majesty's Government, taking all the circumstances into consideration, came to the conclusion that £3,000 should be added to his allowance for the year. That sum was accordingly placed at his disposal, and it was explained to him how it was expected the money should be spent in what might be termed the purposes of his mission, and in discharge of the collateral expenses which he would have to incur. When his Royal Highness returned home an account was rendered by him of his expenditure, and the sum of £3,374 14*s*., as stated in the Vote, was ordered by the Government to be paid to him, because they thought it a reasonable expenditure with reference to the duties he had been called upon to perform. He saw nothing very striking in this transaction. Under a Government like ours, which undertook to regulate minutely the expenditure of the Royal Family, it necessarily followed that the Royal Family must occupy a different position from that of other Royal Families, which had large revenues placed at their disposal, without it being necessary for them to render any account of their expenditure. It seemed to him that that mode of giving those small sums of money was the necessary result of the strict supervision which Parliament thought fit to exercise over the expenditure of the Sovereign and the Royal Family; and he thought there was nothing very remarkable in the fact that if the Prince had to represent the Majesty of England in that visit to the colonies, he should have expended such a sum as they found in the Votes in donations and gifts, which were always expected at the hands of Members of the Royal Family. That was the explanation of the Vote. It was not a matter with which Her Majesty's present Advisers had anything to do; but he had felt it his duty to state the facts of the case as far as he understood it, and he had no doubt that if the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had been in his place he would have been able to give a fuller and more complete account of the transaction than he had done.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought the Secretary to the Treasury had so completely identified himself with the policy of that Vote, and had so fully explained it, that it was hardly necessary for him to add anything in its justification. However, he might observe that, as far as he remembered, when the Estimate for that Vote was submitted to the late Government the principal ground on which it rested was stated to be that it was for the intended visit of his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh to China, Japan, and India, where a very heavy expenditure of that kind might be expected to arise, whereas the Vote was described in the present Estimates as merely being for—

> "Presents and gratuities by his Royal Highness at the Cape and Australia, and during his present voyage in Her Majesty's ship *Galatea*."

Mr. AYRTON: That is a mistake.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: Then it ought to be corrected.

Mr. MONK asked for an explanation of an item of £2,150 to Messrs. Baxter, Rose, and Norton, for services in connection with the Reform Bill of 1867. He rather thought there was a similar item in the Estimates for last year; and he wished to know whether that £2,150 was in addition to the sum already paid.

Mr. FAWCETT said, the reply of the Secretary to the Treasury, as was always the case with his replies, was extremely ingenious, but, to his mind, unsatisfactory. The Secretary to the Treasury said that sum was to be voted to his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh for his expenses, whereas, in the Estimates it was stated that the sum they were called on to vote was not for expenses, but for presents; and that was what had caused such discontent in the colonies. The Secretary to the Treasury said that was a mistake in the Estimate; but why had the mistake not been rectified before? His Notice on that subject had been given some time ago, and the Secretary of the Treasury must have known of the dissatisfaction existing in the colonies on the matter. It was most unsatisfactory that a Minister should come down at the last moment and tell them that the Estimate furnished by the Government was altogether wrong, and that they were not called on to vote that money for presents, but for expenses. The hon. Gentleman had omitted to explain the item of £68 for conveying Prince Christian and the Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz from Dover to Calais.

MR. W. FOWLER called attention to an item of £1,000 for robes, collars, badges, &c., of Knights who had received certain orders, and asked why the expense of those things should not be defrayed by the Knights themselves. He also sought an explanation of an item of £38 3*s*. for "the maintenance of a Congo pirate chief at Ascension."

MR. COLLINS said, he thought it was only reasonable to pay for the gifts of the Duke of Edinburgh in the colonies, as his journey was not in the nature of a private journey; but he thought information was necessary as to the £68 charged for conveying Prince Christian and the Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz from Dover to Calais. Surely that was money not paid with a view to cement the union between England and the Continent.

MR. AYRTON said, it had always been the practice, on certain Royal personages coming on a visit to this country or proceeding thence to the Continent, to provide them with passages, and if we had not a steamer available for the purpose, then to pay for the vessel employed in their conveyance. The expense of these small courtesies was charged to that particular account, and there was no other account in which it could well be placed. It was the custom of this country to treat persons of a certain position in the same way as foreign countries treated members of our Royal Family when they made visits abroad. That accounted for that item of £68. The item of £38 3*s*. for a Congo pirate chief was for his maintenance, not as a pirate, but while in custody, his keep, like that of other delinquents when in custody, falling on the public. As to the charge of £2,150 for Messrs. Baxter, Rose, and Norton, it was incurred by the late Government in preparing their measure of Parliamentary Reform; and, as the House had passed their Reform Bill, it could hardly now refuse their bill of costs. As to the £1,000 for the badges and collars of Knights, it was the practice for the Sovereign who gave the orders to give also the collars and badges, without which the ceremony of conferring knighthood would not be complete; and as long as the badges and collars were so given, they must, of course, be paid for.

MR. WHITWELL, reverting to the item of £68 for conveying Prince Christian and the Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz from Dover to Calais, hoped the Secretary to the Treasury did not regard Prince Christian as a distinguished foreign visitor, but as a distinguished resident in this country. He trusted that would not be taken as a precedent.

MR. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN asked for some information as to an item of upwards of £2,000 for a proposed review in Hyde Park which never came off. He supposed that was some mistake.

MR. AYRTON said, the review did not come off, but considerable expense was incurred in making provision for it.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock;

Committee to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

TELEGRAPH BILL.—[BILL 233.]

(*Mr. Dodson, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr, Ayrton,*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. W. M. TORRENS rose to move, after Clause 24, the insertion of a new clause, the object of which was to provide for the destruction of any record of a message which might remain in the Post Office after the message itself had been delivered. The hon. Gentleman said, from what had occurred in other countries, a feeling of popular distrust had been excited which he should be sorry to see incurred by the Government of this country. In his view the telegraphic system monopolized by the Government, whether for purposes of economy, efficiency, or both, would not stand in the same position as the competition of companies working against each other, and dependent for popularity on their success. According to the Bill as it was framed, they were told to regard every telegraphic message in the light legally of a postal letter. He accepted that definition, and only asked that it should be rigorously adhered to. An open letter was the true definition of a telegraphic message. As long as a letter was in the hands of the officers of the telegraph office it was in the custody of the Postmaster General; but the moment it was out of his possession he had no right to remember its contents, far less to make himself the depository of evidence to be used either in a civil or criminal suit, or to make the Post Office the medium of every scandal or extortion which the wit of man could devise. What was wanted was to give the public confidence. He would not have the thoughtless told that they were liable to have their chance, impulsive thoughts recorded and chronicled, to be dug up by some mischievous person at the end of many months, and used to their prejudice. In the case of a telegram it was impossible for the receiver to know whether it came from the person who appeared to send it; yet that telegram might deal with the honour of a man, the fame of a woman, or, perhaps, decide a contested election. Telegrams were altogether different from letters, and it was not right to enable the Postmaster General to pile up messages to the possible injury of private persons. [Mr. ACLAND was understood to say people should bear this in mind.] That might be the opinion of the hon. Member for North Devon; but the House had to make laws for persons not so well informed as the hon. Member, and they had no right to set a trap for them. The object might be to store up evidence for criminal cases; but that evidence would be forthcoming for civil cases as well, and would even enable the crafty to extort money from the weak. The Post Office would become a confessional, without the sanctity of even morals or religion. ["Oh!"] Those who cried "Oh!" might object to the confessional, as he did on religious grounds; but the Romish confessional was better than this would be, because the priest kept the confession in his breast, while the message intrusted to the Postmaster General would be known to a whole army of clerks, who would not be overpaid, and who should not have unnecessary temptation put in their way. With a view to bring the question to an issue, he had put a clause on the Paper providing for the immediate destruction of messages; but as he had been informed that it was sometimes found convenient to verify a message by letter, he was willing to modify his clause to the extent of delaying the destruction by twenty-four hours. He concluded by moving the insertion of the following clause, after Clause 24:—

(Destruction of transcripts of messages.)

"That so soon as any message conveyed by postal telegraph shall have been duly delivered to the person to whom the same shall have been addressed, or an acknowledgment received for the same, the original and transcript thereof, if any, which may have been made in the Post Office shall be destroyed, and no record thereof, in part or in whole, shall be preserved in the Post Office, or by any person in the employment of the Postmaster General."—(*Mr. Torrens.*)

Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER observed that the whole cause of this Bill having come before Parliament was to facilitate the communication on matters of business by telegraph; and not to accelerate the transmission of messages relating to all sorts of painful secrets. And the question at issue was whether or not it was desirable to have at command evidence to decide an issue between two persons, as, for instance, whether A had bought what B directed him to buy by telegraph. Thinking it better this evidence should not be willfully destroyed he could not vote for the Motion of his hon. Friend.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he thought the legal question had been disposed of by the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend, and dealt with the practical difficulties in the way of adopting the clause. At present telegraph companies retained the original message and transcript for three months for the purposes of checking the receipts at the various offices, to meet complaints of wrong transmission, and other practical reasons. The experience of the Electric and International Company showed that complaints of erroneous transmission were made generally within twenty-five or thirty days after receipt. Then it was necessary to retain those telegrams for a time in order to serve as evidence in a court of law, and although it was quite true that telegrams could not be considered as authentic documents as letters, the House could well afford to leave it to the courts to decide what weight should be attached to them. The discussion the other night led him to infer that some supposed the Government might make use of information obtained through the telegraph for political purposes; but it was clear that if this suspicion had any ground at all the adoption of the clause would make it much easier for the Government to abuse the confidence reposed in it. If the Government could be capable of using the information for political purposes, it must also be assumed the Government would be capable of delaying or even mutilating the messages of its opponents, and the hon. Member's clause would permit of this, because he invites the destruction of all evidence upon the subject within twenty-four hours.

Motion made, and Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY *moved,* the addition of the following proviso to Clause 24, thus placing the Government in the same position as telegraph companies were in at present:—

"Clause 24, at end, add 'Provided always, That nothing in this Act contained shall have the effect of relieving any officer of the Post Office from any liability which would but for the passing of this Act have attached to a Telegraph Company, or to any other Company or person, to produce in any court of law, when duly required so to do, any such written or printed message or communication.'"

Mr. COLLINS asked whether the telegraphs would be liable to the payment of rates?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied that that point was provided for in the Bill of last year.

Proviso *agreed to.*

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that as it was very important that the Bill should proceed to the House of Lords as soon as possible, it would be very convenient, if the House did not object, that the third reading should be at once taken.

Mr. W. FOWLER desired to know what provision had been made against exorbitant demands being made by some of the railway companies on the Government? In the case of the Midland Railway, for instance, the existing lease expired in six or seven years' time; and, although the Bill provided that no other telegraph company could lay wires over the railways, it would be in the power of companies so situated to make large demands upon the Government, unless such a contingency had been provided against.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied that with most of the companies settlements had already been made, and there was no reason, as far as he believed, to presume that there would be any difficulty in settling with the Midland Company or any company so situated, or that better terms than those already accepted by other companies would be awarded upon an arbitration.

Bill read the third time and *passed.*

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Ayrton, Bill to continue various Expiring Laws, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Ayrton and Mr. Secretary Bruce.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 245.]

OFFICES ABOLITION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stansfeld, Bill for regulating the Compensation to be paid on the abolition of Public Offices, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stansfeld and Mr. Ayrton.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 246.]

DIVIDENDS ON PUBLIC STOCKS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stansfeld, Bill for facilitating the payment of Dividends on the Public Stocks, and for making regulations with respect thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stansfeld and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 247.]

House adjourned at half after
Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 30*th July,* 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Seeds Adulteration * (242); Telegraph * (243).

Second Reading—Civil Offices (Pensions) * (157); Married Women's Property (212); Millbank Prison * (234); Fisheries (Ireland) * (236); Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) (226); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * (230); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland Supplemental (No. 2) * (136); Straits Settlements * (231).

Committee—Evidence Amendment (110-239); Contagious Diseases (Animals) (217-240); Jamaica Loans * (204); Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal * (195-241).

Committee—*Report*—Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks * (211); Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. * (209); Valuation of Property (Metropolis) * (229); Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment * (232); Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment * (235).

Report—Contagious Diseases* (221); Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment* (238).

Third Reading—Imprisonment for Debt* (224); County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act (1868) Amendment* (173); Shipping Dues Exemption Act (1867) Amendment* (178); Cinque Ports Act Amendment* (216), and *passed.*

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

(*The Lord Penzance.*)

(NO. 212.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD PENZANCE, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the Bill had been maturely considered by a Select Committee of the House of Commons. Its object was to redress grievances arising out of the present law as regarded the property of married women, which were keenly felt by a considerable portion of the population. The theory of the common law was that all property possessed by a woman at the time of the marriage, or acquired subsequently, passed absolutely to her husband, who in return was bound to maintain and protect her. Her identity merged as it were in his, and she could neither sue nor be sued—she being unable to enter into any contract, and the husband being civilly responsible for her actions. The upper classes, however, had found means to escape from the severity of this system by means of marriage settlements, and the courts of equity had gradually, and step by step, secured the property of the wives of the well-to-do classes from the carelessness or prodigality of their husbands. Among the poorer classes, however, all the harshness of the law made itself felt. Under the common law a man was bound to support his wife, but she had no direct means of obliging him to do so—she could only throw herself on the parish; and if she became chargeable to the public the parish officers had a right of recovering from the husband what was necessary for her bare support. If he squandered the property possessed by her on her marriage she had no redress; and if, during her married life, she earned anything by her industry or talents those earnings became his absolute property. Such a law, regarded in the abstract, could not be deemed satisfactory. According to the last Census there were 3,000,000 of married women in the kingdom, of whom about 800,000 were persons working for wages or earning money in some other way. Now, in a certain percentage of cases, the husband became a spendthrift or a drunkard, and preyed upon her earnings, sometimes seizing and pawning her goods or breaking up her home. The law stood by, leaving him entirely master of the situation, and the more determined a wife was to preserve herself and her children from poverty, the more certain he was to come down and seize upon the pittance she had secured. Magistrates, clergymen, district visitors, and all acquainted with the poor, were aware that this grievance was widely felt, especially in the North, where it was commoner than elsewhere for women to be largely employed for wages. By a recent provision the earnings of a married woman were protected, in certain cases, against her husband—but these protection orders could only be granted where the husband had deserted the wife, and not otherwise. The Select Committee of the House of Commons took last year much evidence as to the frequency of cases of hardship, and they reported that an extension of the system of protection orders, which at present applied only to cases of desertion, to reckless, cruel, and dissipated husbands, would be a very inefficient remedy, since few women, while continuing to live with their husbands, would come forward and expose their domestic trials by making applications to adverse to them. These protection orders, granted under a clause in the Divorce Act to wives deserted by their husbands, had done a large amount of good; but it was obvious that if a worthless husband had a mind to prey on his wife's earnings he would not leave her sufficiently long to enable her to claim the protection of these orders. And, as a rule, such men took care not to desert, in a legal sense, their wives while they could live upon their earnings in idleness and dissipation. The law in this respect was peculiar to England—in no other country, he believed, did the entire property of a wife become the absolute property of her husband. The Select Committee had turned their attention to the state of the law elsewhere. In America, great changes had been made during the last ten or fifteen years, the common law which they inherited from us having been abrogated, and, according to the evidence offered to the Committee, this had not caused disunion in families, or weakened the proper authority of the husband, nor had it put an end to marriage settlements, though it had diminished the number of them. The Bill, which was founded on the recommendations of the Select Committee, proposed that a wife should be capable of retaining the property she possessed at her marriage and afterwards of disposing of it; that as to marriages now in existence the wife should have all property accruing to her after the passing of the Act; that she might sue and be sued as if unmarried; and that her estate should at death be distributed in the same way as her husband's would be. As to subsequent marriages, women were to hold property belonging to them at the time or acquired afterwards. There were subsidiary clauses making the wife liable to the Poor Law for the support of her husband and children. He did not conceal from himself that the Bill proposed to make a fundamental change in the law which had hitherto regulated the relation of husband and wife—that it revolutionized that law. He could quite understand the alarm which some persons might feel at the notion that the wife could bring an action against the husband, and could deal with her own property — such a proposition was so utterly at variance with the principle of the common law that alarm and doubt might reasonably be generated. It might be urged that the indirect effect would be to set up two independent authorities in one household; that the proper authority of the husband in his own house would be weakened, and that disunion would be promoted. But notwithstanding that those feelings were natural in the mind of anyone who contemplated those changes for the first time they would not, he trusted, induce their Lordships to refuse to read the Bill a second time. On the other hand, the common error of reformers was to fix their eyes upon a particular grievance, and to propose a sweeping change, without reflecting that the law with which they were dealing provided for cases in which there was no evil as well as for those in which there was an evil. We might flatter ourselves that the large majority of marriages were not unhappy, and that there would generally be no desire on the part of married people to squander the property of each other; while it was possible that unions which had hitherto been harmonious would be seriously interfered with by the tendency to set up two independent authorities. Where the marriage was a success, and where the harmony of the home was maintained there was clearly no necessity for a change of this kind; and he supposed it was hardly necessary to say that by the very terms of marriage the husband ought to be the paramount authority in his own home. He understood that there had been a recent discovery by profound thinkers that there was no moral or intellectual difference between the sexes such as lead to the subordination of the one to the other. Truth, however, in the common affairs of life, lay very near the surface, and those who dug and delved into the lower strata of thought sometimes brought up ingenious theories, but rarely practical truth. His own belief was, that the relations of husband and wife were founded upon a condition of things which had existed without exception in all times and in all parts of the earth—the husband being the protector and support of the wife, and the latter subordinate to and reliant upon him; nor did he think that the women of this country would desire a change in an order of Providence which was the source of the highest pleasures which either men or women could enjoy. Unless the old idea of the husband being paramount and the wife subordinate was an effete and worn-out theory, the law obviously ought to follow in the same track, and hence the actual state of the common law. But it did not follow that grievances should be tolerated, and the practical question with which they had to grapple was, how far the paramount authority of the husband could be reconciled with a reasonable protection to women who are tyrannized over and down-trodden by those who disregarded their marriage obligations. If it was right that in an harmonious home the husband should support and protect the wife, there was no reason why, where harmony ceased and the home was broken up, the law should not step in and strip him of rights which had become a tyranny. It would not be difficult, he thought, to provide that the authority of the husband and the ordinary comity of goods should remain so long as the parties lived together; but that when the home was broken up, or the husband did not perform his duties, the wife should be protected by the law. It had been suggested that an extension of protection orders might meet the difficulty; but to this it had been objected that the extreme unwillingness of the wife to go before a magistrate would, except in very aggravated cases, render this a dead letter. It had also been felt that to give the husband a right to his wife's property, barred only upon application to a magistrate, was to put matters on a wrong foundation, and that if, on the other hand, the law recognized the wife as owner of her earnings, she would be elevated in the eyes of her husband and likely to be better treated. These considerations, which had weighed with the Select Committee, were well worthy of their Lordships' attention. He regretted that the Bill had only come up to this House within a fortnight of the close of the Session, and he feared that by no amount of diligence on the part of their Lordships could it be sent back to the other House with any necessary Amendments in time to become law this year. He was anxious, however, that their Lordships should show their sympathy for the suffering class and their readiness to consider the question by reading the Bill a second time. The Preamble simply affirmed the desirability of amending the law of contract and property as to married women, and the principle of the measure was that the evils to which he had referred should be remedied, so that their Lordships would not be committed to anything further. This would facilitate the re-introduction of the measure next Session, in order that at no distant date a remedy for the existing evils of our marriage law might be provided. The promoters of the Bill ought not to feel surprise if persons did not in hot haste abandon settled opinions, which probably resulted from their familiarity with the present law, and if the measure did not find immediate acceptance. It had made its way — he was going to say slowly, but certainly progressively — in the House of Commons, the majority last year being only 1, whereas this year it was considerable— not 1 lawyer out of 33, as he was informed, voting against it. People would doubtless become educated into regarding the Bill more favourably than at first sight; but it would not be surprising if it at first underwent severe scrutiny. On the other hand, he would remind the opponents of the measure that the existing grievance was neither a temporary nor a trivial one, it being widespread and fruitful in misery.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª." (*The Lord Penzance.*)

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, who had given notice of an Amendment that the Bill should be read a second time this day three months, said, he did not intend, after the noble and learned Lord's speech, to press that Motion. That speech admitted that it revolutionized the present relations of married life—which was of itself a sufficient reason why the House should pause before making so enormous a change. He admitted at the same time, that the existing evil was of the greatest weight, and called for prompt legislation. Other evils, however, might be created by the present Bill, which would enable a wife to dispose of her property, and leave her husband without subsistence. The noble and learned Lord had rightly remarked that reformers were too apt to sweep away authority instead of restraining; whereas, care should be taken to separate the use from the abuse. He was glad that the question had been taken up by such a high authority as the noble and learned Lord, and thought that ultimately some remedy might be found for admitted evils, without revolutionizing a law which had existed time out of mind; but he could not support the Bill in its present shape.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR desired to express his general approval of the principle of the Bill; but, at the same time, he thought the details of the measure required very careful consideration. But it was evidently impossible that any Bill on the subject could pass during the present Session. The experience of the last few years, and the facts stated by his noble and learned Friend, left little doubt of the necessity of protecting women of the humbler class who acquired property by their labour. As regarded those in a better position, he would remind the House that from a very early period the Court of Chancery, feeling the necessity of affording married women protection, had taken care that when any fund exceeding £200 came before them to which a married woman was entitled, they would not part from it until she had had ample opportunity of securing it, or a portion of it, to herself and her children. This attempt to mitigate the severity of the common law showed that the grievance had been long felt; and, though the upper classes were to a great extent protected, it was but right that as regarded women of the poorer classes a remedy should be provided. Having been so long acquainted with the great value of that protection to married women, he could not but express his assent to the principle of the Bill.

LORD CAIRNS acknowledged the fairness with which the noble and learned Lord (Lord Penzance) had stated both the arguments against the Bill and the objections which might be preferred to its particular form, and believed that by not carrying the measure any further this Session the end in view would be furthered. He was himself a supporter of the principle of the Bill; but he wished to explain what he regarded as its principle. There were two kinds of protection provided by the Bill. One regarded protection to the earnings of married women. It had always appeared to him impossible to defend the existing law as regarded the earnings acquired by married women through their industry and talents. It was inconsistent with justice that she should have no voice in the disposition of those earnings. The other protection related to the law which transferred to the husband absolutely all property belonging to the woman at the time of the marriage. In regard to this, it must be remembered that while the common law gave all present or future property to the husband, there was during a very long period, and increasingly in modern times, a standing protest against it in the circumstance that, with the rarest exceptions, a settlement was agreed to when the families were able to afford it, putting the property of the wife on a footing directly at variance with the common law. This being the usual practice among the upper classes, the law ought to provide for those who could not afford the expensive luxury of a settlement, and in some way give like protection to women with a small property. These two points he regarded as the principle of the Bill. But a number of its clauses went further, and others would require a careful consideration by a Select Committee, for they raised a host of difficulties, and were the Bill to pass in its present form the whole law relating to husband and wife would be thrown into confusion; the result of which would be a much greater change than would accomplish the object in view. At this period of the year careful examination by a Select Committee was out of the question; but he would not oppose the Motion to read the Bill the second time.

LORD DUFFERIN said, there was a strong feeling in Ireland in favour of legislation in this direction, a number of Petitions numerously signed having been intrusted to him for presentation.

LORD ROMILLY desired to express approval of the principle of the Bill. No doubt, it would revolutionize the common law, but not the existing law, for the former practically applied only to the poor, the other classes almost universally excluding its operation by marriage settlements. The humbler classes, not being able to afford settlements, experienced much suffering and hardship. Among the upper classes a woman's portion was usually well ascertained at the time of the marriage, and it was rare for a lady of the higher ranks to acquire any money afterwards by her industry, this being almost invariably confined to literary qualifications; but among the lower classes it was common for a married woman to earn considerable sums by her own industry or the exercise of her talents, and all this is taken by the husband. He should have been glad if one or two clauses in the Bill could have been passed this year; but he admitted that the Bill, taken in its entirety, required more careful consideration than could at present be given to it. He earnestly hoped, however, that next Session their Lordships, who did such good service in Select Committees in questions of this kind, would alter the present law, which practically made the women of the lower classes the slaves of their husbands.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, that a Bill of this kind, dealing universally with all marriages, was not analogous to settlements, which were formed to meet the peculiar circumstances of each case. Unless settlements were brought within the reach of the poorer classes, they would not enjoy the same advantages as the rich.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY admitted the necessity of proceeding cautiously in this matter, the tendency of the Bill being materially to alter all the relations of husband and wife. To appreciate the necessity of legislation one must go to the manufacturing districts, where many married women earned large wages and carried on distinct employments. Their earnings were a great temptation to idle and profligate husbands, and the most heartrending things occurred, homes in many instances being broken up and the wife and children sent to the workhouse. This was a wide-spread and increasing evil, and he trusted that earnest attention would be given to it next Session.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly.

EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 110.)

(*The Lord Penzance.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 (14 & 15 Vict. c. 99. s. 4., part of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 85. s. 2., and 17 & 18 Vict. c. 125. s. 20. repealed).

LORD DENMAN objected to witnesses being allowed, as a mere matter of caprice or convenience, to substitute an affirmation for an oath.

LORD CAIRNS took the same view, and said that he had already pointed out on the second reading of the Bill that the 1st and 4th clauses in their present form would have the effect of doing away with judicial oaths altogether. They proposed that if witnesses simply disliked to take an oath they should be allowed to affirm that what they were going to say was the truth. He thought it would be quite sufficient to provide for the case of those who had conscientious scruples against taking oaths, and for the case of those who declared they were so unfortunate as to have no religious belief whatever. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was anxious to encourage a state of feeling which would lead persons to regard a solemn statement as equally obligatory with an oath — and this, no doubt, was desirable; but if the country were to be educated up to that point oaths should be abolished altogether. Now, however much it might be regretted, large numbers of people regarded statements made under the sanction of an oath as much more solemn and requiring much greater accuracy than others. This was shown by the frequent appeals to witnesses by Judges and counsel to remember that they were on their oath, and it was notorious that truth was thus elicited in many cases where it would not otherwise be extracted. If it were left to individual discretion, the witness who at present would not tell the truth unless he was sworn would decline to take the oath; while it would be taken by the witness who in any case would tell the truth—so that those who most required the obligation would escape it. Sometimes the only witness to a particular transaction was a person with no religious belief, upon whom the sanctity of an oath had no binding effect, and some provision should be made for such persons as well as for those who had religious scruples. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Penzance), who was not responsible for the present form of the Bill, might bring up Amendments on the Report limiting the operation of the Bill to those two classes.

LORD PENZANCE admitted that the effect of the clause would be wider than was intended. He had considered the noble and learned Lord's objections, and as he thought they were well founded he had no objection to introduce such alterations in the clause on the Report as would meet his noble and learned Friend's view.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Parties in actions for breach of promise of marriage).

LORD CAIRNS moved the addition of a proviso, to the effect that the plaintiff in any action for breach of promise of marriage should not be entitled to a verdict unless his or her testimony was corroborated by some other material evidence in support of such promise.

LORD PENZANCE said, he had not the least objection to the Amendment.

Amendment made.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 239.)

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 217.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Extent of Bill).

THE EARL OF FEVERSHAM said, that although the Bill so far as it went gave, no doubt, considerable satisfaction to many persons, the impression, at the same time, prevailed among the agricultural classes that it did not go far enough in the direction of imposing restrictions on the importation of foreign cattle. He should, therefore, move that the following new clause be inserted after clause 20:—

> "Notwithstanding anything herein-before contained, no foreign animals shall be landed at any other than the ports or parts of ports so defined by the Privy Council, and such animals shall not be moved alive therefrom, except for slaughter to slaughter-houses adjacent thereto, licensed by the Privy Council, or except after undergoing a quarantine of not less than fourteen days, and being pronounced free from disease: Provided always, that such regulation shall not apply to the following animals if conveyed in vessels which shall not have touched during a period of three months preceding at any port of any country which may have been affected with cattle plague or sheep-pox—namely, animals imported from any country in which during the previous twelve months cattle plague or sheep pox shall not have existed, and through which animals shall not have passed from countries so affected."

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, it was quite impossible for him to agree to the clause of his noble Friend, which differed very little from one which, when moved in the House of Commons, was rejected by a large majority. He could understand, although he entirely disapproved, the adoption of a system under which every foreign animal brought into this country should be slaughtered at the port of landing; and he could also understand the principle on which this Bill was based—namely, that of intrusting large powers to a Department to be exercised under the authority of Parliament. He was unable, however, to comprehend how such a principle as was embodied in the noble Earl's clause could be adopted. If there were a "hard and fast" line drawn by Act of Parliament, the inevitable result would be that the parties with whom that Department of the Government had to deal would take their stand on the enactment and insist that the Department should be guided by it and by it alone. The result of the clause, if carried, would be to prevent healthy cattle from coming into the country whenever it could be shown that there had been a single case of disease in any part of any country through which the healthy cattle had passed. Such a provision would be totally inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, and he trusted therefore their Lordships would not agree to it.

On Question ? their Lordships *divided*—Contents 11 ; Not-contents 56 : Majority 45.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 3 to 63, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 64 (Water and food on railways).

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, some people thought that under the clause as it stood the railway companies would only be obliged to fill their troughs on a demand being made to that effect. To remove all doubt, he moved the insertion of words providing that every railway company should have a supply, to the satisfaction of the Privy Council, of water and food for animals at such stations as the Privy Council should from time to time by order direct; and that animals travelling along the line should be supplied therewith on the request in writing of the owner of such animals or of any persons in charge of them.

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL said, that in his remarks last night he had ventured to suggest that twelve hours, rather than the thirty hours mentioned in the Bill, should be the maximum length of time during which these poor suffering animals should remain without a supply of food and water. He found that in 12 & 13 *Vic.*, c. 92, there was a power to supply food and water to animals which might be impounded after twelve hours, and the owner who neglected to provide food and water was made liable to the charges incurred by the person who did so provide them, and for this reason he had thought that twelve hours should be the limit in this case. Questions had been addressed by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to the most eminent veterinary surgeons in the kingdom as to whether, considering the natural requirements of these animals and their increased thirst when crowded together in railway trucks and steam-boats, they ought to remain longer than twelve hours without food and water. The whole of the answers sent in were decidedly in the negative, and some of the writers said that the time ought to be much less than twelve hours. He might state that those answers were all given without fee or remuneration of any kind. However, he had the opportunity last night of conferring with benevolent persons who were deeply interested in that subject, and in consequence of certain difficulties which had been pointed out to him in connection with the "untrucking" of those poor animals, he thought he would, perhaps, be doing the best he could do for their interest in adopting the suggestion made to him out of pure kindness towards those suffering creatures, that he should fix the limit at twenty hours instead of twelve by his Amendment. He therefore proposed to insert twenty hours for the thirty hours named in the clause. By that Amendment he must abide, and he trusted their Lordships would be pleased to spare those dumb creatures those last ten hours of suffering—the worst in their whole journey.

An Amendment *moved*, in line 42, to leave out ("thirty") and insert ("twenty.")—(*The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol*).

THE EARL OF ROMNEY said, he was sorry the right rev. Prelate had not insisted on twelve hours. Twenty hours he thought excessive. In the United States of America the different States had their own laws on this point, and some States had fixed eight hours and others ten hours as the utmost limits.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, he entirely sympathized with the object which the right rev. Prelate and the noble Earl who had spoken last had at heart, and he had a suggestion to make which he trusted would meet their views. There was no doubt considerable difficulty connected with "untrucking"—a process from which the animals suffered very much; and to enact off hand by a provision which was to take effect immediately that water was to be supplied every twelve hours to cattle travelling by railway would, he thought, be a somewhat hasty and ill-advised proceeding. He would therefore suggest that the clause should be left as it stood, but that words should be inserted requiring water to be supplied to cattle after they had travelled thirty consecutive hours, or such other period, not less than twelve hours, as the Privy Council might by Order in Council from time to time direct—making thirty hours the maximum. That would leave it open for the Privy Council to consider what arrangements might be fairly and judiciously made with the railway companies in the matter.

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL was grateful to the noble Earl for the suggestion he had just made, but felt it to be his duty to stand out for a maximum not exceeding twenty hours, as the period within which food and water should be supplied.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, there was no doubt that many cattle now came from Scotland in very good condition, and he could not advise their Lordships at once and without due consideration to substitute twenty hours for thirty.

On Question, That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 40; Not-Contents 29: Majority 11.

Amendment made by inserting "or such other period not being less than twelve hours as the Privy Council may from time to time direct."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Further Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 240).

TRADES UNIONS (PROTECTION OF FUNDS) BILL—(No. 126.)

(*The Earl of Morley.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that its object was temporary, being to protect the funds of trades unions until another Bill was introduced next Session on the subject. At present these trades unions were regarded as private societies, and were prevented from taking advantage of the Friendly Societies Act of 1865. By this Bill they could, by depositing a copy of their rules, as provided by the 44th section of the Friendly Societies Act, be brought within its scope, and a remedy given in cases of misappropriation, where at present there was no remedy at common law. The simple object of the Bill was to prevent the misappropriation of the funds of trades unions, and the Bill would remain in force for one year only.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Morley*).

LORD CAIRNS said, the Bill was anomalous and premature, inasmuch as a Royal Commission had sat on the subject, and the Bill was not framed in accordance with any of that Commission's recommendations. The Government evidently hoped by this Bill to get trades unions recognized in some way or other as friendly societies; for the measure recited that although the object of the society might be illegal, inasmuch as it tended to restraint of trade, yet it should rank as a friendly society for the purpose of protecting its funds. If the measure were necessary, there would be some shadow of excuse for accepting it; but it was not—as the Act initiated by Mr. Russell Gurney protected the funds of legitimate friendly societies — and he objected to giving trades unions, illegal in their object, the protection of the law.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, the measure was necessary, and had resulted from a somewhat strict construction having been put on the word "illegal" as applied to trade societies by the Court of Queen's Bench, which had declared that persons joined together as a trade union, not for the purpose of restricting trade by intimidation, but simply resolving among themselves not to engage in their trade except under certain conditions, were illegal. This decision prevented the societies from recovering money due to them, or punishing those who embezzled their funds. This decision had created great alarm among the trades unions, and, in consequence, a Bill had been introduced in "another place," giving to trades unions all the benefits enjoyed by friendly societies; but, thinking this was out of the question, the Government had resolved to introduce this temporary measure, in order to protect these societies from robbery, until the whole matter could be dealt with in a comprehensive manner.

In reply to Lord CAIRNS,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, the decisions of the courts were that, if a society had anything in its rules which operated in restraint of trade, then it was an illegal society.

LORD CAIRNS: The result is, we are now to declare that, although its regulations may operate in restraint of trade, they are, notwithstanding, to make a society a legal society.

On Question, Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 30*th July*, 1869.

MINUTES.] — NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* New Sarum, *v.* Edward William Terrick Hamilton, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

SELECT COMMITTEE — Plans for New Dining Rooms, &c., *nominated.*

Report—Abyssinian War [No. 380]; New Law Courts [No. 381].

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Resolutions [July 29] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions reported*—*Ordered*—*First Reading* — Harbour of Galle Loan* [250]; East India Loan* [251].

Second Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance* [245]; Dividends on Public Stock* [247].

Committee—*Report*—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [223]; Inclosure of Lands (*re-comm.*)* [31]; Militia Pay*; Basses Lights (Ceylon)* [224]; Accounts, &c. Presentation* (240).

Considered as amended—Militia (Ireland)* [222]; Public Works (Ireland)* [202]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment* [208]; Nitro Glycerine* [235]; Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* [236]; Criminal Lunatics* [172]; New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment* [225].

Third Reading—Seamen's Clothing* [242]; Nitro Glycerine* [235]; Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* [236]; Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul)* [237]; Criminal Lunatics* [172];

Clerk of Assize* [203]; Railways Abandonment* [219]; New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment* [225]; Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* [87], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Public Offices Concentration (*recomm.*)* [196].

The House met at Two of the clock.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE JENKINSON said, he rose to give notice that, unless the Government undertook to deal with the subject of Capital Punishment, he would ask leave, early next Session, to introduce a Bill to alter and amend the existing law in regard to the present system of the revision and commutation of Capital Sentences; and he would now beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department to grant a Return of all Convicts, male and female, who have been reprieved from the execution of Capital Sentences passed upon them during the last ten years.

MR. BRUCE said, that if the hon. Baronet would give notice of the information he wanted, it should be granted as an unopposed Return.

ARMY—PROMOTION IN THE NON-PURCHASE CORPS.—QUESTION.

MR. EYKYN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the existing and almost total stagnation in promotion in the non-purchase corps, as evidenced by the fact that in the (Old) Royal Artillery, numbering over one thousand officers, there has been only one step of promotion over a period of seven months, it is the intention during the present Session to act upon the scheme for promotion in those corps by adopting the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1867, or by any other plan of which the Bill for the Commutation of Pensions might or might not form a part; or when they intend applying any remedy for the dead lock in promotion now existing?

MR. CARDWELL said, in reply, that the Committee to which his hon. Friend referred had made two recommendations, one of which was that the Government should have the power of purchasing retiring allowances for a capital sum; and the other was an alteration, specified in the Report, of the scale of retirement. The first of these recommendations had been carried into effect by a Bill which, within the last few days, had received the Royal Assent and become law; but there would not be time, during the present Session, to deal with the remaining part of the plan.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—HOGARTH'S PORTRAIT.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. DISRAELI said, that perhaps the House would allow him to make one remark with respect to a Vote which passed the Committee of Supply the other night. The House would remember that it had been his duty to vindicate the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery from the charge that at the sale of the portrait of Hogarth at his easel, painted by Hogarth himself, the Trustees did not fulfil their duty, and that in consequence of the want of funds, a precious picture was lost to the country. On that occasion he vindicated the conduct of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, and stated that they had offered 350 guineas for the picture, but that a gentleman from Manchester bade a greater sum. In consequence of the debate which then arose, the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery had received a communication from which it appeared that the picture was purchased, not by a private gentleman, but by the well-known firm of Messrs. Agnew and Sons, picture dealers, of Manchester. In their letter, the Messrs. Agnew stated that they bought the picture for their own collection, giving a large sum for it, but not a price exceeding its value; that they were perfectly unaware at the time that they were bidding against the country; and that, therefore, they would have the greatest pleasure in waiving their claim to the painting, and in allowing the National Portrait Gallery to have it. It was so rare a thing for dealers in pictures to waive their right to valuable works of art, that he thought it due to Messrs. Agnew and Sons that the fact of their readiness to give up the picture to the nation should be known. He would read one or two paragraphs from the letter of Messrs. Agnew and Sons to the Trustees of the National Gallery. They said—

> "We bought the picture for our stock, and without reference to any particular purchaser, and at a sum we consider much below the value of a work by Hogarth of unsurpassed interest. . . . . We shall not stand in the way of the country acquiring this important picture, which every lover of art must desire it should possess. From the debate in the House we received the first intimation that it was sought to purchase the picture for the national collection. We consider it to be our duty, as it is no less our pleasure, to offer the picture to the Trustees for the sum bidden by their agent.

That was conduct on the part of Messrs. Agnew exhibiting great public spirit; and it gave him pleasure to call attention to it; and he might add that this was not the first time he had to notice the public spirit of Manchester.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £1,008,343, Customs.

(2.) £1,604,616, Inland Revenue.

(3.) £2,362,841, Post Office.

MR. BENTINCK said, he rose to call attention to the postal arrangements between England and Italy. The first point was that no morning mails were despatched from Paris to Italy; so that it made no difference whether letters to Italy were despatched to Paris by the night or morning mails. This was a matter of the greatest possible inconvenience to those engaged in commercial pursuits. He had never seen any good reason why the French did not despatch a morning mail. A morning mail was despatched to Italy by way of Marseilles, but not by way of Toulon or the Mont Cenis route. Then there was the delay which seemed to be imposed in mere wantonness by the French Government on the mails to Italy. The route from Paris to Italy, whether by Marseilles or Savoy, was the same till they arrived at Macon, but the mail from Paris to Marseilles ran the distance to Macon in eight hours, while the mails to Toulon and to Mont Cenis took nine hours and twenty minutes. On leaving Macon matters became materially worse. Before the Victor Emmanuel Railway fell into the hands of the Paris, Lyons, and Mediterranean Company, express trains ran between Culoz and St. Michel, but now the Italian mails and passengers were carried by slow trains—by very slow ones, indeed, as anyone would testify who had travelled by that line of late years. So that between Paris and St. Michel there was a completely unnecessary loss of two hours and thirty minutes, of which the only conceivable object was to discourage travelling by the Mont Cenis route and to induce as many travellers as possible to prefer that by Marseilles and Nice. As he said before, the Marseilles trains run from Paris to Macon in eight hours, while the trains carrying the mails for Italy took nine hours and twenty minutes. From Macon to St. Michel they took seven hours and twenty minutes, whereas at so low a speed as twenty-five miles an hour, including stoppages, the journey would be performed in six hours. Thus, one hour and twenty minutes was lost between Paris and Macon, and one hour and ten minutes between Macon and St. Michel, making two hours and thirty minutes at least wasted between Paris and St. Michel. The Italian mail train now left Paris at 8.40 p.m. There was probably no reason why it should not leave at 8 p.m. as it formerly did. If the Mediterranean Company could be induced to put on a fair rate of speed, which it would be perfectly easy for them to do, the mail might perform the journey from Paris to Turin in twenty-two hours, and from Paris to Florence in 34½ hours. It seemed impossible to imagine a valid reason why this service between Paris and Florence should not at the present time be thus performed, were that the good pleasure of the French Government and of the Mediterranean Company. To assist comparison and appreciation he would give the different speeds at which the mail from London to Florence travelled over the different sections of the journey. London to Dover 88 miles, at 44 miles an hour; Dover to Calais, steamer, 21 miles, at 12 miles an hour; Calais to Paris, 184 miles, at 33½ miles an hour; Paris to Macon, 273 miles, at 29¼ miles an hour; Macon to St. Michel, 147 miles at 20 miles an hour; St. Michel to Susa, 50 miles, at 9½ miles an hour; Susa to

Florence, 323 miles, at 23½ miles an hour. The Italian service, notoriously, as a rule, less expeditious than the French, maintained a speed of 23½ miles an hour, including the passage of the Appenines, while the French mail service from Macon to St. Michel reached only twenty miles. Better proof could hardly be required that the loss of two and a-half hours by the French trains was intentional; and it was no invidious inference, but an inevitable one, that things were so arranged for the benefit and gain of the Marseilles and the Mediterranean line. As regarded the journey homewards there was constant complaint. The mail from Marseilles left at 8.34 p.m. and arrived at Paris at 5.10 a.m., which gave plenty of time to catch the morning mail to England at 7.40 a.m., and allowed the passengers to arrive in London the same evening. But the postal train from Italy was due at Macon at 8.10 p.m., yet the Italian mails and passengers were obliged to wait at Macon till 9.24 p.m., arriving in Paris at 6.55 a.m., too late, under ordinary circumstances, to catch the morning mail to London. He had received about three weeks ago a letter from the Minister of Public Works at Florence, which stated the case precisely to the same effect. He would not trouble the Committee with an acccount of the difficulties that had been thrown in the way of the Fell Railway. Every difficulty had been thrown in the way of that system by the French Government, and by the spirit of protection which animated the inhabitants; but he was glad to find that the energy of the company was in the way of surmounting them. He could assure his noble Friend the Postmaster General that he had not brought forward this subject with any desire to embarrass the Government, or the Post Office; but as the complaint he made was not without reason, and as he found that such a statement made in the House of Commons, if not disapproved by the Minister, when noticed in the newspapers abroad often had considerable effect in inducing a foreign Government to give way on points which ought never to have been disputed at all, he hoped his noble Friend would give a favourable consideration to the facts of this case. He also wished to ask, referring to quite another subject, Whether there is any objection to affix Letter Boxes for posting Letters to the Mail Railway Vans according to the system adopted in France? He thought that would be a great convenience, and any difficulty might be obviated by increasing the postage stamp to 4*d.* or 6*d.*

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he would be very glad if the result of public attention being called by his hon. Friend to the question of our communications with Italy should be to produce some improvement. He was quite aware that the inconvenience and delay stated by his hon. Friend did exist; and it was true that up to the present time no attempt had been made by the British Post Office to obtain a remedy. Of course his hon. Friend must be aware that they had no control whatever over the trains which conveyed the mails through France. The only train in France over which the English Post Office had any control was that which conveyed the Overland Mail to India. No doubt the inconvenience of there being virtually no evening mail to Italy was much felt by the commercial community, and it was extremely probable that an opportunity would shortly arise for bringing this matter before the French Government. The Committee were aware that the route to Italy by Brindisi was in process of development, and it was possible that a considerable saving of time might be afforded by that route. When that was done it would be the duty of the English Post Office to enter into communication with the French Government upon the subject of forwarding the English mail bags as quickly as possible through France, and also to request them to accelerate the ordinary mails to Italy. He had no official knowledge of the fact, but he had heard that the French Post Office did not, like that of England, expend large sums in order to obtain the entire control of particular trains. The French Post Office, he was told, paid the railways a comparatively small sum for the use of the ordinary trains, and they did not therefore possess the power which the English Post Office claimed to compel railway companies to run trains at hours not the most convenient to themselves. Considering, however, the large sums paid by the English Post Office to the French Government for postal facilities, he would avail himself of the first convenient opportunity he could find to address them on the subject. With respect to the question of affixing letter boxes to the ordinary mail trains, as in France, he had considered the subject, and found that the consequence would frequently be that through misapprehension on the part of the public the letters, instead of being accelerated, would be taken out of the way. He had, however, made an arrangement equally convenient to the public, by which a letter with an additional fee of 2*d.* might be received in the railway Post Office van by the mail guard and the sorter, and if its delivery would be accelerated by being taken by that van it would be forwarded.

MR. BENTINCK said, the explanation of the noble Marquess had been quite satisfactory.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £709,780, to complete the sum for Post Office Packet Service; no part of which sum is to be applicable or applied in or towards making any payment in respect of any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863 to Mr. Joseph George Churchward, or to any person claiming through or under him by virtue of a certain Contract, bearing date the 26th day of April 1859, made between the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Admiralty (for and on behalf of Her Majesty) of the first part, and the said Joseph George Churchward of the second part, or in or towards the satisfaction of any claim whatsoever of the said Joseph George Churchward, by virtue of that Contract, so far as relates to any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863.

MR. BAZLEY asked whether the noble Marquess had entered into any negotiations with the United States with regard to cheap oceanic postage between the two countries?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that no negotiations had been entered into with the United States; but since the Resolution come to by the House he had given the most careful consideration to the subject, and as soon as the state of Public Business would permit he would bring the matter under the consideration of the Government. It was a very large and important question, because a reduction of the postage to 3*d.* would entail a loss to the revenue of between £40,000 and £45,000 a year. The object to be attained might be desirable, but such a loss ought not lightly to be incurred. Nor would this be the whole extent of the loss, because some modification of our postal system with Canada would be required, and it was probable we might be called upon by the Canadian Government to pay a considerable sum towards the loss inflicted upon the Canadian revenue by these arrangements. The demand would not stop there, because similar claims to reduction might be expected to be made by Australia and India. Before this reduction was sanctioned by the Government, and before negotiations were entered into with the United States, the whole subject must be looked at, and the Government would have to face a very considerable sacrifice of revenue. It would not, however, be necessary to enter into negotiations until a period had arrived more nearly approaching to the beginning of next year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £90,000, Telegraph Service.

(6.) £5,000, to complete the sum for Common Law Courts.

COLONEL SYKES said, the House had a just cause of complaint that Supplementary Estimates of £200,000 had been issued for fixed and permanent charges, which must have been foreseen, and ought to have been included in the regular Estimates. There was an item of £88,000 for the Court of Chancery, £26,000 for the Chief Court of Bankruptcy, and £18,500 for the salaries of the District Court of Bankruptcy. He also complained that this Supplementary Estimate was only delivered that morning, and probably had not been seen by half the Members who were thus called upon to vote away money in ignorance.

MR. AYRTON said, that the Vote before the House was a re-Vote, in consequence of the expenditure incurred in the previous year not having been paid. According to the more exact system now adopted, the sum had become an additional charge nominally, but not substantially. The Votes for the Court of Chancery, the Chief Court of Bankruptcy, the District Court of Bankruptcy, and the Vote for Superannuations and Retired Allowances, were all Votes that were necessary in consequence of the Bill passed by that House to reform the Bankruptcy Law, and the necessity of paying the salaries of the officers of the Courts of Chancery and Bankruptcy, which were now all to be paid out of Votes in Supply. A Bill had been passed this Session by which in future these different items would be paid for by

Votes in Parliament, instead of out of special funds paid into the Exchequer, and not under the control of Parliament. As, however, the Royal Assent had not yet been given to the Bill, it became ncessary to take a sum in gross to meet the charges thus created. But a few days, comparatively speaking, had elapsed since the Bill went up to the House of Lords, so that it was absolutely necessary to include these items in a Supplemental Estimate. The Vote for Science and Art was, in fact, a re-Vote of money granted by Parliament as far back as 1865. A foot-note to that item explained that £3,000 was voted in 1865, but only £1,200 was spent, and the balance still remained to be paid to complete the transaction.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the very object of a Supplementary Estimate was to cover charges rendered necessary by the legislation of the Session. Admitting, however, the perfect accuracy of the explanation given by the Secretary to the Treasury, he thought that, as regarded the purchase of land in Dublin, in connection with Science and Art, the necessity of it might have been foreseen in time for the sum to be included in the original Estimates.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £5,000, to complete the sum for Military Prisoners.

(8.) £88,500, Court of Chancery.

(9.) £49,500, Court of Bankruptcy.

(10.) £1,200, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department.

(11.) £8,000, Endowed Schools, England, Commission.

(12.) £30,000, to complete the sum for Superannuations and Retired Allowances.

(13.) £4,500, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.

(14.) £68,118, Greenwich Hospital and Schools.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL—[BILL 223.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Captain Vivian.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. Ayrton

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, there were some parts of this Bill which had taken him by surprise, as he believed they would also surprise the House. It certainly was remarkable that a Government, which from its highest to its lowest Members was pledged to strict economy, should propose to throw away £1,500,000 On the previous day a hard struggle was made to effect a saving of £10,000, which failed because there were a great many Members who did not understand the details of ambassadorial expenditure. But there was no Member of the House, whether his seat were on the Treasury or Opposition Benches, or whether he sat below the Gangway at either side, who did not know and recognize the fact that this was simply a waste of money. In a country with so many hundred miles of frontier the attempt to render impregnable any one spot was a very doubtful undertaking, even if the progress of artillery science did not threaten to render impracticable this idea of impregnability. Mr. Whitworth had stated several years ago that he would undertake to throw 70-lb. shells, filled with molten iron, a distance of six miles. And his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Bright) — he wished he were now in his place—had spoken strongly on this very question of fortifications. Of the military authorities, the right hon. Gentleman had stated that "they would walk blindly into any expenditure;" and that on looking into the recommendations which had been made as to fortifications he was "amazed at the absolute stupidity—or, if a milder word were wanted, he would say the absolute lunacy—of the military authorities on this subject." The right hon. Gentleman also urged on the House upon the same occasion that public opinion was misled and apprehensions unnecessarily excited by the language of Cabinet Ministers. It was not a wise commercial practice to throw good money after bad, and therefore he moved that the House do go into Committee that day month.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Taylor,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. CARDWELL said, that if the question were now whether fortifications should be built or not, the opportunity would be a suitable one for the objections of his hon. Friend. But the question was not whether they should begin to build fortifications by means of loans or not; the question was whether, having completed four-fifths of those fortifications, they should, or should not, complete the remainder, or should be like the man in Scripture who began to build a tower without counting the cost of finishing it? The Bill was founded on these principles—That the loan works should be brought to a final close; that they should not exceed the estimate contained in the last Act of Parliament; that all works not already commenced, so far as the loan was concerned, should be abandoned; and that the works which had been begun should be utilized as much as possible, and completed as economically as possible. He would not enter into any controversy upen the general question of fortifications; but thought that by going into Committee a most useful solution of the question would be arrived at.

COLONEL SYKES said, that nine years ago, when this matter first came before the House, he resisted the proposed fortification scheme, and pointed out the absurdity of the panic on which the proposal was founded, and which arose from certain colonels in the French army telling the Emperor that they were ready to invade England. As soon as the story reached this country a panic was created in this House, emanating from the Treasury Bench; and it was stated that we were to be invaded and defeated by the French, and that it was necessary to defend ourselves with brick and mortar fortifications. He then declared that we could best resist invasion by the strong arms and bold hearts of our population without the help of brick and mortar. He was ridiculed for that opinion, but the result had shown that the fortifications were unnecessary, and he had annually protested against the waste of the public money upon them. In a Return which he had moved for in 1867, a list was given of no less than seventy-two fortifications in progress in different parts of England, some of them of very considerable size, and others mere batteries. The estimate for the fortifications was £6,905,000; but then those fortifications would require 1,104 guns to arm them, 9,841 artillerymen to work the guns, and 22,441 infantry to support the artillerymen, and that would involve a cost of £2,000,000 more, making the total cost more than £9,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman said that some of the proposed fortifications were to be abandoned; but he would like to know how many of the seventy-two were to be abandoned, and whether the sum now asked for would suffice for the entire completion of those works which were unfinished? It was the old unjustifiable story to say that because so much had already been laid out unprofitably, the works must be finished; but, unhappily, it seemed as though John Bull's purse was regarded as inexhaustible. Under the circumstances he should second the Motion of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor).

MR. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, that some of the works had been built by contract, and they were already beginning to crumble to pieces. The fortifications at Dover were in a disgraceful condition. The stones did not join, and the works were beginning already to fall out of repair. He hoped that in the case of those fortifications which had to be finished the work would be done by the engineers in the army, or at all events under their immediate supervision. He hoped that the £1,500,000 now asked for would be all that would be spent; but he feared that as it was, it would take a considerable annual sum to keep the fortifications in anything like proper repair.

CAPTAIN VIVIAN said, he would refer the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Sykes) to a Return presented during the present Session, showing the whole of the forts which were to be finished, together with those which were to be abandoned.

MR. MUNTZ said, that however absurd the original Vote was, he thought it would be better now to go into Committee on the Bill and see if any reduction could be made in the amount. Under the influence of panics we were apt to rush into every sort of expenditure, and generally into the wrong expenditure. If, when this particular panic arose, we had organized an effective militia—which at present we did not possess—we might have saved this nonsensical expenditure on bricks and mortar. As though, forsooth, an enemy would choose to land just opposite a large fortification when he had the choice of going thirty or forty miles off.

CAPTAIN BEAUMONT said, he hoped to be able, in making the Motion that stood in his name in Committee, to give a satisfactory answer as to the utility of these fortifications. It would be most injudicious for the House to offer any obstruction to the completion of the fortification scheme indicated by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, which would give us the greatest amount of efficiency at the minimum of expense.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he would support the Motion of the hon. Member for Leicester. He regretted that the Government should not introduce Bills of this character at an earlier period of the Session. In 1860, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had delivered a powerful speech condemning the whole of this fortification scheme, and since that period events abroad had shown that fortifications were more useless than ever.

MR. COLLINS said, he had originally opposed the fortification scheme; but as we had spent so much money in carrying it out he thought we had better not grudge the small sum necessary to complete the works which had been begun. We had already spent 17*s.* or 18*s.* in the pound.

MR. BAZLEY observed that when the fortifications were completed, the country would have to bear the cost of keeping them in repair.

COLONEL STEPNEY said, he thought that the country need not fear being led into undue extravagance under the present Administration.

MR. WHITE said, he must protest against the enormous and useless outlay which it was proposed to make upon these fortifications.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 100; Noes 32: Majority 68.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (The sum of 1,510,000*l.* to be issued out of the Consolidated Fund towards expenses after mentioned).

CAPTAIN BEAUMONT said, he rose to move a reduction in the amount asked for on account of the fortifications. Being an Engineer officer standing in the somewhat anomalous position of moving the reduction of a Vote for fortifications, in the construction of which he had himself been engaged, he wished briefly to explain his view. The object to be attained by fortifications was two-fold—first, strategical positions for the defence of the country; and, secondly, the protection of our dockyards from bombardment or attack by sea. It had been said that forts were useless unless they were continuous; but that was not the case, because no general dared to leave a fort in his rear without detaching a force to watch it; but the question of the Spithead Forts had always been considered as distinct from the general question of fortifications; first, on account of the enormous cost of mounting guns in such a position; and next, on account of their not being absolutely necessary to the vitality of the dockyard, but only tending to prevent the possibility of a bombardment. Sir John Burgoyne stated that an important distinction was to be drawn between protecting the Portsmouth Dockyard from bombardment, and protecting it against occupation by an enemy. By bombardment the dockyard would suffer injury which might be repaired; whereas its occupation by an enemy would involve total destruction. He (Captain Beaumont) admitted that the anchorage might be made more secure; but he thought that the vessels of the fleet ought to be able to take care of themselves. The position he wanted to make out was this—that the utility of these forts, although considerable, would still be incommensurate with the amount of money proposed to be spent on them. The whole question of fortifications was essentially a matter of economy. The duty of the Engineer officer was to give the greatest amount of defence for the lowest amount of money. With respect to the expense of the fortifications, the original estimate was £8,000,000. The Government proposed a reduction of £500,000. This left £7,500,000;

£6,000,000 had been voted, and they were now asked for £1,500,000. What he proposed was that the two Spithead Forts should be constructed with one tier of guns instead of two. That would effect a reduction of £114,000 on each, or on the two forts in round numbers of £225,000. The circumstances in which those two forts would be completed were somewhat different from what they were when they were designed. The use of torpedoes or marine mines could not be neglected. This made the necessity for establishing the two tiers of guns on the Spithead Forts less apparent than formerly. Supposing they could retrace their steps he doubted whether these forts would be constructed as they had been. He certainly should have voted against them. The wisest course would be to complete them in as economical a way as possible; and if circumstances should arise to make it desirable to complete the forts according to the original design, it would be quite competent hereafter to furnish them with two tiers of guns. His own impression was that the work when completed would be creditable to the War Office; but if the Spithead Forts were now completed as designed, he felt confident in ten years they would be in a somewhat similar position to that in which they now stood. He moved that the sum of £1,510,000 be reduced by £225,000, representing the saving which would be effected by completing the Horse Sand and Noman's Land Forts at Spithead with one tier of guns in place of two.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 11, to leave out the words "one million five hundred and ten thousand," in order to insert the words "one million two hundred and eighty-five thousand,"—(*Captain Beaumont,*)—instead thereof.

MR. CARDWELL said, that the question which the Committee had to consider was which was the wisest and most economical arrangement to make with regard to the forts. He had carefully avoided all controversy upon the general question of fortifications. He had been anxious to prepare a Bill which those who were favourable to fortifications would approve, and which need not be objected to by those who were opposed to fortifications. It was to be borne in mind with regard to these fortifications that four-fifths of the whole expenditure had already been incurred, and that the Committee had determined by a large division to complete the work as economically as possible. If economy consisted in avoiding all expenditure of money, there would be no doubt as to the course to be pursued; but the real question was how to get the largest amount of money's worth for their money. Was it wiser to complete the Spithead Forts according to the original design with two tiers of guns, or to save £225,000 by substituting one for two tiers of guns? He had been desirous in this Bill of saving money wherever he could, and he should not differ from his hon. Friend in attaching great importance to the saving of £225,000. He was, nevertheless, strongly in favour of completing the forts according to the original design. It was natural to attach some weight to authority, and, in the first place, he might appeal to the name of Sir John Burgoyne, not as an individual, but as a member of the Defence Committee. He could appeal also to the Fortifications Committee, presided over by a distinguished sailor, Sir Frederick Grey. In 1867, when the late Government were in Office, the Fortifications Committee considered the question whether the plan of giving the Portsmouth forts two tiers of guns should be abandoned and one tier substituted. They came to the conclusion that in the case of three of the forts one tier should be substituted for two; but in the case of the two principal forts, to which the Motion had reference, they said that, having in view the great importance of the position as commanding the entrance to the Channel, they were unable to agree to this change in the original design. The inquiry did not end there. The late Government thought it right to consider whether it was not desirable to retain two tiers on the deep-sea side, and to have only one on the shoal side. The combined Committees examined this proposal also. Still, looking to the great importance of the position, they determined that it was not desirable to effect that reduction, and they gave what appeared to him to be strong and adequate reasons why it was desirable to retain two tiers all round—both on the shoal side and the deep-sea side. His hon. Friend had himself pointed out that, if these forts were made as they were designed, they would not only deny the entrance to an assailing force, but would prevent the bombardment of the great naval arsenal, secure an anchorage for the Navy, and a refuge for merchant shipping. These were very great advantages. His hon. Friend said they might leave the Navy to take care of itself. He had no doubt it would take care of itself, but they wanted to take care not of the Navy, but of that great arsenal, the mother of the Navy. It had been truly said that the place of our naval force in time of war was not on our own coast, but off the enemy's coast, and no one would expect the British Navy to be lying at Spithead in the time of the country's greatest need. But after a gallant and even a victorious encounter in the Channel some vessels might be disabled, and obliged to go back to Portsmouth to re-fit, and a safe anchorage would be invaluable to them. His hon. and gallant Friend had spoken of two or three shells being thrown on Portsmouth Dockyard. But did any one suppose that all this expense had been incurred to prevent the throwing of two or three shells? Portsmouth was our principal dockyard, now in course of being very greatly extended, and the object of this expenditure was to deny an entrance to a hostile fleet. It was proposed to authorize an expenditure of £648,000, which would bring up the total amount to £1,056,000. From this his hon. Friend proposed to deduct £225,000. But for this reduction of one-fifth of the whole expense of defending Spithead they would lose one-half of the total power of preventing an enemy from bringing his force to bear in a hostile attack. The question did not end there. The anchorage at Portsmouth had not one, but two entrances. They had incurred a large expenditure in arming the entrance at the Needles, and this sum of £225,000 would be very little more than one-tenth of the whole expenditure at Portsmouth, which was between £1,800,000 and £1,900,000. The entrance by the Needles had been effectually barred, and if the anchorage of Spithead were also made safe they would practically render an attack impossible. He would ask, then, whether it was economical after having spent nine-tenths of the sums required, for the sake of saving one-tenth, to leave one entrance still open to a gallant enemy? To illustrate it in another way. With two tiers of guns on these forts there would be ten guns bearing on each hostile ship as it approached, and the shot of the higher tier descending on the deck would be more destructive than the guns of the lower tier, seeing that the deck of a vessel was not plated with iron of the same thickness as the sides. For each of the guns of the two tiers they would have to pay £8,663 at one of the forts, and £9,438 at the other, whereas if they had only one tier, and if they divided the cost of the foundation and the construction of the fort among the smaller number of guns, they would have to pay £12,500 in one case and £14,062 in the other. True economy then would direct that the forts should be finished upon the plan originally contemplated. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had stated that these forts were to be assisted by torpedoes. The hon. and gallant Member could not attach more importance than he did to those wonderful inventions, which, he agreed, would play a very important part in the future defence of our harbours. There were, however, two classes of torpedoes—the first were mechanical and denied the channel not only to our enemies but to ourselves also; while the second were electric, and denied the channel to our enemies alone, leaving free access to ourselves. It was necessary, however, in using the latter that they should be protected by forts. The hon. and gallant Member further said that if we were to build the forts with only one tier of guns at first, we could add the second tier, if necessary, at any future time; but when the Committee were recommended to adopt that course on the ground of economy, they would first have to calculate the difference between the cost of completing the forts at once and re-commencing the works at some future time, and judge whether it would be worth while for the sake of a small temporary saving to connect ourselves to a greatly increased expenditure at some future time. He did not intend to enter into the controversy with reference to the necessity of the fortifications at all, but would content himself with referring the Committee to the report of the distinguished engineer Colonel Brialmont of the Belgian Army, speaking in the highest terms of the professional ability which had been displayed in the construction of these forts, and to the Report of the Committee recently laid before the House. Under these circumstances, he trusted the Committee would support the Bill as it stood, and would reject the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member.

MR. MUNTZ said, the right hon. Gentleman had failed to convince him of the utility of completing these forts on the original model. Sometime after the fortifications were commenced, and the necessity arose for more money, the *ad misericordiam* plea was advanced that as so great an undertaking had been commenced it ought to be finished. Believing there was some justice in the plea he voted for going on with the works; but as there was now a definite proposal to reduce the outlay by £225,000, merely by substituting one tier for two tiers, he thought it should be taken advantage of, as it was both wise and economical. He contended that to expend such a vast sum of money as was intended upon these forts was very impolitic, and that for a very simple reason. He quite admitted the value of the forts as a protection for our arsenals, but the science of artillery was in a state of rapid transition. Year after year important improvements were being effected in the manufacture of guns; and those which were last produced entirely superseded those which were made immediately before. It was, therefore, not a very outrageous thing to believe that in the course even of a short time such further improvements would be effected as would render these forts altogether useless. This reason alone was sufficient to make him support the Amendment.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 82; Noes 73: Majority 9.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

On Question, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill,"

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN asked whether the iron shields, for fixing which a sum of £190,000 was proposed to be taken, were to be employed solely for sea defence or partly for land defence; and whether any of them were to be used in connection with the Moncrieff gun?

MR. CARDWELL said, that in the statement which he had caused to be circulated it was set forth that for the purposes of retrenchment the shields would be confined to the outer sea defences. Where the Moncrieff gun was used there was no necessity for shields at all.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHARITIES.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. NEWDEGATE:* Mr. Speaker, I wish at the onset, in reference to the Notice which stands in my name on the Paper, to call your attention to the fact that I propose to limit the term over which the Return I ask for should extend, in such a manner as I hope will facilitate the production of part, at all events, of the information of which I think it desirable that the House should be in possession. The Motion in its present shape is for—

> "An Address for Return showing the number of Deeds or Instruments enrolled in the High Court of Chancery under the Act 23 & 24 Vic. c. 134, being an Act to amend the Law regarding the Roman Catholic Charities, and under any subsequent Act relating to or enlarging or extending the said Act, giving the names of the Trustees; the date of their execution of such deeds or instruments; and a summary or short description, together with the number of acres, of the property to which such deeds or instruments relate."

And I desire, Sir, to alter this Notice by inserting the words "during the last three years" after the word "enrolled," in the second line, and trust that you will make this insertion before you propose the Notice from the Chair. The House will be glad to know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary will consent to the production of this information, since I have not received any answer to a communication which I have addressed to him? In anticipation, however, of the right hon. Gentleman's reply, I beg to explain to the House that early in the present Session, on the 26th of February last, I moved for a Committee of this House to inquire into the operation of the Roman Catholic Charities Act of 1860, and also into the Burials Registration Act of 1864. I acted, Sir, in conjunction with Sir Charles Selwyn and Sir William Bovill, when Members of this House, in their support of the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis, who promoted the passing of the former of these statutes in 1860, and on the 26th of February last I made a statement with regard to the Roman Catholic Charities Act. The purport of that statement I will repeat as briefly as possible. In the year 1853, after an inquiry as to the Roman Catholic charitable property had been instituted by a Committee of this House, which extended through the Sessions of 1851 and 1852, the Government of that day determined upon introducing a Bill for the better regulation of charities generally by providing for their proper registration, with a view to prevent those great abuses the existence of which had been known to Parliament ever since the year 1818, when the late Lord Brougham moved for a Committee, which still bears his name, and thus broke the ice for future legislation on the subject. Notwithstanding Lord Brougham's exertions, however, it was not until the year 1835 that there was any serious prospect of legislation; and then an Act was contemplated to empower Commissioners to inquire concerning the state of charities generally. The difficulty which the Act of 1860 was intended to remove then first appeared. In the year 1835 the Roman Catholic Members of this House objected to the inquiry proposed to be made by the Commissioners then to be appointed by statute, because they feared the discovery of certain violations of the Act against superstitious uses in the conditions upon which part of the property connected with their religion was held; and in consequence of their remonstances no powers of inquiry with respect to Roman Catholic charity property were intrusted to the Commissioners who were appointed in the year 1835. I think I cannot do better, Sir, than quote a few words from the speech of Lord Chelmsford, then Sir Frederick Thesiger, in the year 1853, in order to show to the House in the tersest manner possible how the Legislature arrived at a similar determination with respect to the statute of that year. On the 4th of August Sir Frederick Thesiger said—

> "He wished to remind the noble Lord of the Bills which had been introduced from 1844 downward, for the purpose of establishing a Board for the administration of charitable trusts. In 1844, 1845, 1846, Bills were introduced in the House of Lords by Lord Lyndhurst. In 1847, 1848, 1849, and 1850, Bills were introduced under the Government of the noble Lord by the late Lord Cottenham. In 1852 another Bill was introduced by the noble Lord and his Government, which Bill was taken up by Lord Derby's Government, who endeavoured to pass it into a law. Now, he would ask the noble Lord if any of these Bills contained any exemptions respecting Roman Catholic trusts? If these Bills never contemplated such exemptions, surely that was an argument more forcible than any which the noble Lord had drawn from the exemptions in the Acts passed, not for the purposes of legislation, but merely for the establishment of preliminary inquiries."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxix. 1256.]

That, Sir, was said by Sir Frederick Thesiger, in remonstrance against the exemption of the Roman Catholic charity property from the general Act of 1853, proposed by Lord John Russell. Whilst speaking on that occasion, Sir Frederick Thesiger adverted to this circumstance—

> "An hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Chisholm Anstey), formerly a Member of that House, who, in 1847, proposed to introduce a Bill for the regulation of Roman Catholic Trusts—on that occasion the hon. and learned Member said—'The trustees of the Roman Catholic charities may be guilty of any amount of maladministration without the Roman Catholics—for whose benefit the trust was created—daring to ask relief, because the issue of an application with that object may be a declaration that the charity was *ab initio* illegal, and continued illegal." '—[*Ibid.* 1258.]

These were the words of Mr. Chisholm Anstey, who in 1847 introduced a Bill intended to obviate this difficulty. Lord Russell stated, in answer to Sir Frederick Thesiger, as his apology for excluding Roman Catholic charity property from the general Act of 1853, that, after the Bill had been read a second time, Roman Catholic Members came to him and urged that it was positively necessary that their charities should be exempted, on the same ground that their exemption was claimed in 1835. Thus, in 1853, the Roman Catholic Members distinctly claimed separate legislation with respect to their charitable trusts, and although the House showed great unwillingness to comply with their wishes, and the granting of the proposal was carried by a majority of 11 only, still, for seven years after that date, nothing was done with respect to the Roman Catholic charities, notwithstanding that we had it upon the authority of a Roman Catholic lawyer in this House that very gross abuses existed in the administration of these charities; that fact, Sir, was proved before the Select Committee of 1851 and 1852 on evidence which was perfectly unimpeachable, the evidence of Roman Catholic priests and others, who complained that they had been deprived of their interest in, had been defeated in objects for which they had acquired property, and devoted it to Roman Catholic charitable uses, by the authority from Rome, by the exercise of influences which they deprecated, and by means which the law ought to have stayed, but which it could not reach, for the simple reason that there was no statute applying to the peculiar circumstances of Roman Catholic charity property in this country. Well, in the year 1860, as I have already stated, the two learned Members of this House whose names I have mentioned, with myself, agreed to tender our support for this purpose to Sir George Lewis, and the Act passed, with the high approval of Lord Campbell, which he expressed first to myself and afterwards in the House of Lords. Unfortunately, the then Attorney General, Sir Richard Bethell—since Lord Westbury—had introduced a clause into that Bill which, from the first, Sir Charles Selwyn warned the House would have the effect of defeating the whole object of the enactment, which was valid enrolment. I allude to the 5th clause. I will not go into its details further than to say that I am a competent witness to the fact, that the liberal intention of the House was to validate all trusts for Roman Catholic uses, which had been held for that purpose for twenty years, without inquiring at all as to whether the titles were invalidated under Lord Hardwicke's Act by any malpractices or by any circumstances whatever; but there was no intention on the part of the House to give that which was intended to be a retrospective provision a prospective effect. I understand, however, that this clause has been so construed that if any person chooses to place in the hands of any Roman Catholic trustees property for charitable uses, and that arrangement remains unquestioned for twenty years from the time of the gift; that after the expiration of the twenty years, according to this statute, there is no need for the enrolment of the uses of the property. It is only natural, therefore, to suppose that, through such a loop-hole as this, evasions of the necessity to specify the uses of the property are perpetually taking place. I am not, Sir, speaking on merely speculative grounds as to the difficulties which these ineffective non-enrolments produce among various classes of the community. One of the difficulties which have come to my knowledge concerns the tenant of a farm. He could not ascertain who the owners—that is, the trustees—really were. He had always paid his rent to an agent, but when he sought to discover the real owners, the trustee, or trustees, he found that he had no means whatever of doing so. Sir, the whole purport of this statute of the 23 & 24 *Vict.* c. 134, is to provide facilities for enrolment, and that a correct description of the property and the uses, with the names of the trustees who really hold it, shall be entered in the Rolls Court — that is, the Court of Chancery. Well, what happened? This happened. This Act, I am sorry to say, is so defective — and the ingenuity of some lawyer, I suppose, has discovered its defects—that it does not provide for the registration of the names of any but the first trustees. These may resign the very next week after they are appointed, appointing new trustees, and the new trustees need not be registered. The original trustees may all resign but one, and he may be a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic. And what chance of recovery would there be in an action on behalf of the unhappy tenant of some farm or an heir-at-law against a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, who is sworn to poverty? Why, none at all. I would not have intruded upon the House had I not the support of the opinion of persons most competent to give information upon the subject; and, even at the risk of wearying the House, perhaps I may be allowed to read an extract from a letter which was intended for my instruction, and which is written by an eminent lawyer, now practising in London. I wish I had time to obtain his leave to give his name; but as I have not the House will forgive me if I read his letter to the House without mentioning the name of the writer. He writes in these terms—

> "The law of England leans very strongly against dispositions by which land is tied up so as to be rendered inalienable. Hence the rule against perpetuities, which prohibits the settlement of real estates for any greater period than a life, or lives in being, and twenty-one years afterwards.

Thus, a gift to A for life, and after his death to his unborn son for life, and after the death of such son to his eldest son—the latter limitation is void. The Legislature has, at all periods since the Reformation, set its face against alienations in mortmain, and whenever a corporate body has been authorized to purchase or take land the quantity has been restricted. Thus, to pass over numerous other instances — By the 4 & 5 *Vict.* c. 38, being 'An Act for further Facilitating the Acquisition of Sites for Schools,' no more than one acre could be acquired for that purpose, though this was afterwards extended by the 14 & 15 *Vict.* c. 24, and the 15 & 16 *Vict.* c. 50, by the powers of which a gift might be made of one acre to each ecclesiastical district of one parish, and by the latter of which the quantity was enlarged from one to two acres. By the Literary and Scientific Act, 1854 (17 & 18 *Vict.* c. 112) one acre of land only can be acquired by gift or purchase for sites. And by the Companies' Act 1862 (25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 89), no company formed for the purpose of promoting art, science, religion, charity, or any other like object, not involving the acquisition of gain, is allowed to hold more than two acres of land without the sanction of the Board of Trade. The Roman Catholic Charities Act, 1860, loses sight of these principles of our law and legislation, and without inquiry, has made valid large and unascertained dispositions of land in mortmain, much of which was vested in unknown persons upon secret trusts created by parole, and has even given effect to dispositions of land actually void in law (being given for superstitious uses), by declaring that such dispositions shall be held upon such of the trusts of the charity as are valid in law. The quantity of land now held in mortmain by the Roman Catholic Church can only be known by a searching inquiry into the number of deeds enrolled under the Act of 1860, which there is every reason to believe, from the enrolments which have taken place, and particularly during the first year after the passing of the Act, is of considerable amount. It is true that enrolment is necessary to give validity to deeds of trust; but this affords no security against the acquisition of land by Roman Catholic institutions, through the medium of trustees, for the benefit of monasteries, convents, &c., the deeds relating to which are never registered, the trusts upon which they are held being secret. The trustees, it is true, may die, but upon the death of each of these another person is chosen in his place, so that ultimately the property is dealt with and governed by persons who have not, and care not to have, the legal estate vested in them.'"

Then comes the point to which I have also adverted—

"They can lease and let, as owners, and there is no one to dispute their title; but even if upon the death of the trustees, or any of them, a conveyance were made to any new and surviving trustees, or to the new trustees only, as the case might be, no enrolment of any such deed is necessary, as has been decided in the case of 'Ashton *v.* Jones,' 28 Beaver's Reports, 460, nor would any lease to be granted by the trustees for the time being require enrolment."

It is singular that such was the laxity of the law far back in mediæval times, and that it should have occurred again in our days.

"'—— *v.* Glyn,' 12 Simon's Rep., 84 (a case in equity), and 'Walker *v.* Richardson,' 2 Meeson and Wilsby, 882 (a case at law). The fiscal aspect of the subject is of no little importance as regards the welfare of the country. Lands acquired in mortmain, whether under deeds enrolled or by secret means, are taken out of the market for ever; they cease to be the subject of conveyance, mortgage, settlement, and testamentary disposition, and thus the revenues of the country are and will be continually lessened. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that after the first payment of £10 per cent under the Succession Duty Act, in the case of gifts to charitable uses, there will be no further duty payable; so that, in respect of the several duties before referred to, the land may be said to be abstracted from the country."

Now, Sir, I can vouch for that being the opinion of about as competent a lawyer as could be consulted on the subject; and I am prepared to show, from circumstances that are daily occurring, that the law of mortmain, which is held in force against all other denominations, and against scientific and other societies, is almost totally evaded through the defects in the provisions of this Statute, defects which have been remedied in the Bequests Act applying to Ireland, under which Roman Catholic charity property is held in that part of the United Kingdom; and in this statute defects somewhat similar to those I am describing have been provided against by a subsequent enactment for the improvement of that statute. One object, then, which I have in view, by moving for this Return is to show that we have this Act of 1860 nominally applicable to the whole of the Roman Catholic charity property in this country; but that the provisions of that Act are so defective that there is not sufficient enrolment to enable a tenant who has held a farm on lease, when he comes to the end of the term, and has a claim against the owner to discover an owner, a trustee, against and from whom he would have a fair chance of recovering—the fact being that he has only known the agent. That is a case in point; and, with the permission of the House, I will now proceed to show that there are very large masses of property annually devoted to these purposes. When I had the honour of addressing the House on the 26th of February last, I called to the recollection of hon. Members the case of Mr. Hutchinson, who died at the Oratory at Brompton, and at whose death a sum of £40,000 passed to

Father Faber, the head of that establishment. That was proved before the courts of law, and it was held that Father Faber was personally as an individual entitled to the money; but it was mistakenly held that he did not take the benefaction or bequest on the part of the community. It is a very singular circumstance that the Oratorians declared that they did not hold their property in common; and that declaration has been accepted by the courts in England. A similar declaration was also tendered to the Italian courts, and at first accepted by those courts; but the Italian courts have finally decided that the plea of non-community of property is invalid in the case of this very Order, on account of the discipline and arrangements of the Order, although no actual vow of community is exacted from the members of the Order; but that such is the discipline that their property is practically held in common. In the sense, then, of the decision of the Italian courts, therefore, £40,000 went in that case to the Order of the Oratorians. I also recited to the House the case of Miss Thompson, who, after she had become a nun, left property to two learned gentlemen, who are well known in our courts, for Roman Catholic uses. In that case the learned Master of the Rolls decided that the bequest was made under duresse and was, therefore, invalid, and so £40,000 escaped from being devoted to Roman Catholic uses on account of the discovery being made that duresse had been exercised on the testatrix. I have also here the particulars of a case which has recently occurred, and for the accuracy of which I can vouch. This letter has been addressed to me. I know the writer of it well, and I can vouch for his accuracy. He says—

> "Allow me to give you one single case which has come within my own personal knowledge. A friend of mine one day lately said to an old man who had become a pervert—'Surely you are to leave your property to some national object. I know you have no near relatives, and I know your peculiar religious views; but surely you might find some national object which your wealth would advance—our country needs it. For example, the endowment of some chair in our University.'" (He was a Scotchman.) "'No, no!' was the answer, 'I find that my property at one time belonged to the Church of Rome; my priest tells me it is only right I should be an honest man and return all the property to the Church; hence, after my death, it shall go to the Church.' I was curious to know how the property had been disposed of. The old gentleman died, and I am told the property was sold on behalf of the Church of Rome, and was purchased for £200,000. This is in poor Scotland. What, therefore, must be the amount of property fast accumulating in wealthy England?"

As I can vouch for the accuracy of this statement, I think it would be needless to read long calculations—as I did in my speech of the 26th of February—in order to show, from the vast increase which has taken place in Roman Catholic institutions, particularly convents and monasteries, that large masses of property have been accumulated, and are accumulating for their support. Lest, however, it should be said that I have slurred over this part of my case, I will adduce the authority of the late Cardinal Wiseman, and no one will dispute the account which he gave at Malines as probably containing something like the truth with respect to the increase of these Roman Catholic institutions. The Cardinal said—

> "Allow me now to present to you, by means of statistics, a rapid view of the effect produced by these different measures. The Census gives the population in England — for the year 1831, 13,896,797; for 1841, 15,914,178; for 1851, 17,927,609; for 1861, 20,906,224; an increase of about 2,000,000 in each decennial period. From 1831 to 1841, the population, therefore, increased 14 per cent. In the same period the number of priests increased about 25 per cent, or nearly double. During the following ten years the population increased 13 per cent, the number of priests 45 per cent. Lastly, from 1851 to 1861, while the population increased 12 per cent, the number of priests increased about 37 per cent. Here, again, are the precise statistics which will allow you to judge of the continued increase of the Roman Catholic Church in England. In 1830 we numbered but 434 priests for the whole of England. At present we have 1,242, that is to say, three times as many. The number of our churches, which was 410, has now increased to 872; from 16 convents which we possessed in 1830 in the United Kingdom, we have now, in 1863, 162. Lastly, in 1830, we had not a single religious house of men, in 1850 there were 11, and to day their number is 55."

Such is the account which was given by Cardinal Wiseman in 1864, and he, I suppose, must be held an unimpeachable authority; but I have some other statistics here, which are taken from Roman Catholic sources, the accuracy of which I have no reason to doubt. These represent that—

> "The increase of Roman Catholic institutions has recently been very great. In 1829 there were no monasteries nor convents publicly announced, and there were but 447 priests, and 449 chapels and stations. In 1841 there were 1 monastery, 16 convents, and 9 colleges. In 1851 there

were 17 monasteries and 53 convents. In the present year there are in England and Wales, 1,122 churches, chapels, and stations, 18 convents, and 67 communities of men, altogether illegal, with inmates probably amounting to 3,000 males and 13,000 females. In connection with such institutions, real or personal property to a very large amount is, no doubt, fast accumulating, as well as for masses for the dead and other superstitious uses of the Romish religion. If each inmate of a convent bring a dowry of, say, £250, this would amount above to upwards of £3,000,000."

I cannot give the exact amount of this property; but this we know, that it is accumulating very rapidly; that it is, moreover, accumulating in mortmain; and under circumstances as regards the law of mortmain, different from the circumstances which are allowed by the law with respect to the religious or charitable property of any other community. The history of this country, as well as of others, tells us of the dangers which arise to the national welfare from allowing this property to increase to such an extent as this without restriction of any kind—such restrictions as are in force with respect to the property of every other denomination against its increase in mortmain—that, as this description of property is not subject to the same laws as similar property, affords, at least, an argument that exceptional facilities ought not to be afforded to one particular communion such as are granted to no others. Because the history of this country proves—the history of almost every country in Europe proves, that it is the policy of the Church of Rome to acquire an amount of property altogether inconsistent with the welfare of the States in which it obtains influence. I can assure the House that the opinion I have read to it is one among many which I could produce if necessary in order to show that the operation of the Act of 1860, instead of tending to ensure due enrolment and publicity—instead of giving the same securities to those who may deem themselves interested in or entitled to property left for religious uses, whether as heirs, tenants, or otherwise, for the discovery of the real owner, as are afforded by the statutes which are in force in Ireland. Under the Bequests Act and the Act amending the Bequests Act, the enrolment is complete and effective; but under the statute of 1860 it is so imperfect that, to my certain knowledge, without great expense, no one can obtain the information which is often necessary for the regulation of property. I almost fear that I shall be told by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary that the objection to the Return for which I shall move is that the register of the Rolls Court is in such a state that it would take years to separate the property held under this Act of 1860—an Act distinct and separate, made to differ from the general law at the desire and by the will of the representatives of the Roman Catholics in this House, who insisted upon this separate and exceptional legislation. All that I want to obtain by means of this Motion, is, that the same information as regards the three last years should be afforded as to the accumulation, disposition, and ownership of this Roman Catholic Trust property in England as is furnished in Ireland through the medium of the Commissioners appointed under the Bequests Act. I can assure the House that I am not the author or originator of this request. I have the highest legal authority for assuring the House that this information would be most valuable for the purpose of securing many families and many persons from the effects of maladministration and of uncertainty of ownership with regard to this property. It was, in fact, admitted when the Act passed, that there was a necessity for legislation, which arose from want of adequate information as to the actual ownership by trustees. It was in consequence of this belief that the Legislature passed the statute of 1860. The information for which I now apply will, if produced, test my accuracy and that of my informants when I declare my belief that the object of that measure—the due enrolment of trustees and easy discovery of the property held in trust—has been defeated, and in a great degree through the defects in the statute itself, some of which I well remember hearing Sir Charles Selwyn from that Bench in 1860 describe by anticipation and strongly deprecate whilst the Bill was being debated in this House. I beg, therefore, Sir, to propose the Motion which is now in your hands, with the insertion in the second line, after the word "enrolled," of the words "during the last three years."

Mr. DIMSDALE seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "there be laid before this House, a Return showing the number of Deeds or Instruments enrolled during the last three years in the High Court of Chancery under the Act 23 and 24 Vic. c. 134, being an Act to amend the Law regarding the Roman Catholic Charities, and under any subsequent Act relating to or enlarging or extending the said Act, giving the names of the Trustees; the date of their execution of such deeds or instruments; and a summary or short description, together with the number of acres, of the property to which such deeds or instruments relate,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. BRUCE said, the hon. Gentleman had correctly supposed that he intended to oppose the Motion, on the ground that the time which it would take to prepare the Return for which he asked was incommensurate with the value of the Return. He held in his hands a letter from the Secretary to the Master of the Rolls, who informed him that the Return could not be made out without great inconvenience and delay to the Public Business, and that it would occupy the clerks in the Public Record Office two years to get it ready, or, as the Motion was now limited to three years, he might perhaps put it at eight months, or one-third of that period. But, apart from that, he objected altogether to the Motion, because there was, in his opinion, no sufficient ground for making the bequests of Roman Catholics the subjects of special inquiry. The law of England, however different it might be from the law in Ireland, was the same with respect to devises in mortmain made by Protestants and Roman Catholics. His hon. Friend had mixed up with the question a great many others in a most invidious manner. He had cited the cases of bequests to which the Return for which he moved did not at all apply—bequests of money, such, for instance, as that of Mr. Hutchinson, of which no enrolment was required by law. The hon. Gentleman must be well aware that all devises made secretly were not enrolled at all, and that the inquiry would throw no light on such bequests, which might be set aside at any time. The House had here to deal with deeds enrolled under the sanction of the Act of Parliament. For upwards of three centuries the Roman Catholics had been exposed to disadvantages far greater than those which attended the operations of any other religious sect. Their funds were not protected by the law, and every obstacle was placed in the way of their promoting and maintaining their religion. Of late years, however, they had been put on a footing of equality with other sects, and the complaint of his hon. Friend was that they had availed themselves of the liberty which had been accorded to them. Being a good Protestant himself, and believing that his religion was the best, he (Mr. Bruce), of course, wished that all persons were of his way of thinking; but people would hold their own theological opinions, and every good citizen must wish that every religion should experience just and equal treatment, and develop itself in its own natural course. The Roman Catholics had, it was true, made great efforts of late years. No part of the population was formerly so neglected as the Roman Catholics. While in Ireland crime was not more prevalent, but rather less so than in England, the proportion of crime committed by the Irish in this country was four or five times as great as that committed by the English population. This was owing to the circumstance of the Irish population being more exposed to temptation and less carefully looked after than the English were. The efforts of the Roman Catholic gentry and priesthood had for many years past, and especially of late years, been directed to the removal of this evil, and he had no doubt that considerable endowments had been made by them, some legally and some perhaps illegally, for the purpose of improving the religious and moral condition of their poor Roman Catholic brethren. Those efforts, so far as they were legal, all liberal-minded men ought to applaud, and what ground had the hon. Gentleman for endeavouring to cast this slur on the Roman Catholics? His hon. Friend had shown, or, at least, attempted to show, that our legislation in respect of enrolments of deeds in England was less perfect than that in regard to Ireland. Possibly this might be the case; but, if so, the way to remedy the evil was to introduce a Bill to assimilate the English law on the subject with that of Ireland. He hoped, however, that the House would never consent to put the Roman Catholic and Protestant endowments on a different footing. Good reasons might perhaps be adduced in favour of assimilating the laws of the two countries; but, in the meantime, he objected to the Motion of his hon. Friend, on account, not only of the vast amount of unnecessary labour which it would entail, but also, and chiefly, on account of the injustice it would inflict on our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen.

MR. HENLEY said, that the right hon. Gentleman had said, with considerable truth, that there was no reason for dealing specially with any particular class of persons, but he would ask whether, by refusing his assent to this Motion, the right hon. Gentleman was not dealing specially with one particular class of persons? Almost weekly there was now placed in the hands of hon. Members a thick book which dealt with all the charities in England county by county. This was done in pursuance of a recent statute, which conferred the power of dealing with those charities. He thought it was therefore only a fair question to ask why the charities of one particular class of persons were to be exempted from the scrutiny required by the Act? The right hon. Gentleman had stated no reason for that exemption. He did not know what was going to be done with these charities. Large powers had been taken under the Act of this Session, and, in his opinion, we ought to have the means of seeing at a glance an account of all the charities in the kingdom, whether they belonged to the Established Church or other denominations. To this proposition, it appeared to him, the right hon. Gentleman had not addressed himself. Speaking from information given by the Master of the Rolls, the right hon. Gentleman said there were difficulties in the way of making out the Return asked for by his hon. Friend. But, admitting this, it was, in his opinion, the duty of the Government to overcome these difficulties. It was neither fair nor just that the charities connected with one particular form of religion should be exempted from the scrutiny to which all other charities were submitted. If the enrolment under the Act of 1860 were so defective that the required Return could not be made, the Government ought to have the matter looked into and set right.

MR. SHERLOCK said, the right hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House had argued the question on very different grounds from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). The hon. Member had urged that this Return was necessary, because certain tenants did not know who their landlords were. Now, it appeared to him that the enrolment of these deeds under which the property was conveyed to trustees afforded to the world at large, and to the tenantry in particular, rather more information than was ordinarily imparted when property was privately conveyed from one party to another by deeds which were not registered. The Return asked for by the hon. Member would not give the tenants one particle more of information than they might obtain by looking at the enrolments. It might be right that a Return should be made of all Roman Catholic charities, with their amount and application, but this Return would give no such information, although it would involve an immense deal of trouble in its preparation.

MR. G. GREGORY said, he hoped the speech of the hon. Member who had just resumed his seat might be taken as an admission that the charities of the Roman Catholics ought not to be made the subject of exceptional legislation, but ought to be subjected to the same publicity and inquiry as those of other denominations. It could not be said that the Roman Catholics laboured under any disabilities now, as they were in all respects on the same footing as other denominations, and all their endowments, gifts, and donations were under the same laws. He had been surprised to hear the Secretary of State for the Home Department say that large endowments had been made by the Roman Catholics for the maintenance and propagation of their religion, and that, though some were legal and some illegal, still all liberal-minded men should be disposed to protect them.

MR. BRUCE explained that he had made that statement on the authority of the hon. Gentleman who brought forward the Motion. He knew nothing of it himself. His statement had entire reference to the present Motion, which dealt with nothing except deeds regularly and legally enrolled. He had charged the hon. Gentleman with mixing up with this subject other matters which had no reference to it.

MR. G. GREGORY, in conclusion said,

he rejoiced to hear from the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Sherlock) an admission that the charities of all religious faiths ought in that matter to be put on the same footing.

MR. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, he thought the grounds alleged by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for declining to accede to that Motion were calculated to induce the House to vote for it. That right hon. Gentleman refused them information on a very important point, although, as far as he had observed, it was a most unusual thing for the Government to refuse the House and the country the means of acquiring information through a Return on any matter which was of national importance. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had shown very conclusively that it was very desirable that the Return now in question should be produced. And what were the Home Secretary's reasons for withholding it? The right hon. Gentleman had accused the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, in asking for that statistical information, of casting a slur on the Roman Catholics. If to move for Returns was held to be casting a slur on the body of persons to whom those Returns referred, there would be an end to all inquiry on public matters. Then the right hon. Gentleman said the Irish Roman Catholics who came to this country committed four times as much crime as the same number of persons not belonging to that nationality; but that was a most extraordinary argument for opposing the Motion. The Home Secretary also stated that there was great need for improving the lower order of Roman Catholics in this country, and that gentlemen holding that religious belief had very naturally and commendably devoted a portion of their property to that purpose. No Protestant denied their right to do so, nor by asking for information on that subject did any man throw any imputation on the members of that communion. The right hon. Gentleman further urged that the Return could not be given because the Secretary to the Rolls Office told him it would take a long time to give it. Were they never, then, to get any information when its production would cause trouble to officials? In reading the *Guide to the Civil Service* he was astonished to find how little time the members of that service devoted to the public advantage. He did not know whether it was so in the Rolls Office, but those gentlemen, it seemed, went to work about ten o'clock and left at four, and between those hours they generally spent an hour at lunch, and another hour in reading *The Times.* Again, if the right hon. Gentleman was correct in saying that it would require two years to make out this Return, what an enormous amount of property of that description there must be. The documents relating to that property ought to be so arranged in the Rolls Office that information respecting it could be readily furnished whenever it was called for. If the hon. Member for North Warwickshire divided the House, he would certainly go into the same Lobby with him.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he could not quite agree with his hon. Friend the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) as to the value of the Mortmain Act. But that was not the question they had then to consider. The speeches which had been delivered against the Motion presented to his mind no good reason why it should not be adopted. The hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Sherlock) objected to the Motion because it did not go far enough, and would not give them all the information that was desired; but there was no reason why, after having got that Return, they should not move for further details in reference to the same subject. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department told them that within the last few years the Roman Catholic gentry of this country had devoted much of their time and wealth to the promotion of the moral and religious welfare of the poorer members of their Church. Now, that was an excellent and admirable work, and those gentlemen deserved the greatest credit for having engaged in it. But then the right hon. Gentleman said that to institute an inquiry into what had thus been done would be casting a slur upon those labours. That was one of the most extraordinary arguments he (Lord John Manners) had ever heard. He could easily understood that those gentlemen should be unwilling to publish their good deeds, but he was at a loss to imagine how they could be injured or insulted if a public investigation were to be instituted into the subject. He had to state, therefore, that unless he should hear some better arguments against the Motion than those advanced by the right hon. Gentleman, he should feel bound to vote in its favour.

Mr. HINDE PALMER said, the House ought not to assume, from the fact that the making out of that Return would involve great labour, that therefore there was a very large amount of property dedicated to Roman Catholic charities. The difficulty in making out the Return arose from the circumstance that these enrolments were enrolments made indiscriminately in regard to all charities, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, and not merely in regard to all kinds of charities, but also all enrolled patents and enrolled deeds. Therefore, when a Return as to Roman Catholic charities was asked for, of course there was the difficulty to be encountered of selecting the information required from the vast mass of other enrolments which had nothing to do with Roman Catholic charities, or even with any charities whatever. Moreover, what the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Newdegate) wanted to arrive at would not be obtained by any Return of that description, because the hon. Member himself alleged—and no doubt with truth—that there was a large amount of property in this country given to persons under secret trusts for Roman Catholic purposes. There was in this country no record or enrolment of those secret trusts which would afford the hon. Member the information he required. If, therefore, the Government were to grant the Return as moved for, the hon. Member would find it comparatively useless.

Mr. M'LAREN said, it occurred to him that a good deal of explanation was still needed. If Parliament wished to have a Return of all the charities of England and Wales he could not, for the life of him, see why those of one particular sect should be exempted. A short time ago a Bill had been before the House for improving endowed schools, and it was proposed that certain charities should be applied to the purposes of the Bill, many persons believing that those charities were not only useless but pernicious. If that were the fact it was a good reason for ascertaining the amount and particular purposes of those charities, and that had been ascertained; but the Return did not include the charities of a particular body of Christians. If a Return was wanted it should be a Return of the charities belonging to all Her Majesty's subjects, not the charities of Protestants or Catholics, Jews or Gentiles. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) now proposed a mode of supplementing the Return, and all that was said against the Motion was that what he wanted would be difficult to get. But that could be said of many other Returns. There were many Returns ordered by the House which were not produced for one or two years, because information was to be obtained, perhaps, from India, the colonies, or other distant places. Suppose this Return were to take two years, that would be no great matter, because there was no measure of legislation waiting for it. It was merely a piece of statistical information required to show the aggregate amount of all the charities of this country. And although the present Motion might not bring out the whole, some other hon. Member might discover a mode of getting at another part of the remainder. He had not a particle of feeling against his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in this matter, but he thought it desirable that the State should have information of all the charities in the kingdom. Suppose the Prussian Government were to call for a similar Return, would it be thought a good answer from one province that the people there were nearly all Jews, or from another, that they were nearly all Catholics, and so on? The Government would say—"We don't want to know anything about your religion; what we want to know is about your charities." In his opinion the desire of the hon. Gentleman was a reasonable one.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 58; Noes 50: Majority 8.

COMMUNICATION WITH CHINA.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

Mr. BAINES said, he rose to draw the attention of the House to Memorials presented from several Chambers of Commerce, recommending the construction of a Railway from Rangoon through British Burmah to Western China. The question might not have attracted a very large amount of public attention, but the interests involved were of vast importance. The object in view was the construction of a cheap route, chiefly through our own territory, from Rangoon, the commercial capital of British Burmah, to the western provinces of China, and thus bringing our manufactures within comparatively easy reach of the 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 of people inhabiting the Chinese Empire. It was superfluous to speak of the civilization, industry, and fertility of China. Suffice it to say that the actual exports and imports of the five treaty ports of China in 1868 was £38,564,880, of which six-sevenths came from England and India and other English possessions; but the whole of this commerce was with the south and eastern seaboard of China; very little went into the interior, and scarcely any part of it reached the remote western provinces, which vied with the eastern in fertility and manufacturing importance. It was true the western provinces of China were mountainous, but they were rich in minerals, besides being extremely fertile, and inhabited by an industrious population. Lord Elgin estimated the population of the six western provinces at something under 100,000,000, and nothing but their geographical position prevented them being our customers to an unlimited amount. In exchange they had to offer us tea, silk, wool, dye wares, and drugs, cereals of all kinds, cattle, and precious metals, all of the utmost value to us either as raw material or manufactures. But the whole country was practically cut off from England from want of easy communication, although it was only some 500 or 600 miles from Rangoon—the distance from London to Inverness, and 300 from the frontier of British Burmah. British territory, indeed, was only 250 miles from Western China, and it was across this narrow strip of land that the Government was asked to facilitate the construction of a railway, so as to bring the two points within a few hours of each other; whilst the sea voyage from Rangoon to Shanghai, round the Malayan peninsula, was 3,000 miles, and could not be traversed by the fastest steamer in less than from two to three weeks. It would be his duty to prove, by good authorities, first that this object was desirable, and second, that it was practicable. Sir Stamford Raffles, who had gained large experience on this subject as Governor of Singapore, said—

> "It is idle to talk of the cheapness and extent of our manufactures unless we carry them into fair competition. There is no reason why all China should not be in a great measure clothed from England, the cold parts as well as the warm."

Colonel M'Leod, who visited Western China and the Burman Shan States, in 1837, with Dr. Richardson, under orders of Governor General of India, said—

> "Many Chinese merchants with caravans continuously pass to and fro through Esmok, trading between China and the Laos country, and the Siamese and Burman Shan States."

The Chinese authorities on the frontier had offered to Colonel M'Leod every facility and encouragement for trade; and the chiefs of the Shan States expressed an ardent desire to cultivate trade and friendly relations with England. Captain Sherard Osborne, another high authority, when writing, in 1860, pointed out the dangers of navigating the Chinese seas, especially in time of war, and strongly recommended opening the land route to Western China. Now that the French had the coast of Cochin China, the injury to our commerce in those seas in times of war would be most disastrous, but with the land route we should have nothing to fear. But the route was shown to be as practicable as desirable. Captain Williams, Engineer and Inspector of Public Works in Burmah, and resident there during ten years, reported, in 1865, as follows:—

> "Of the three routes the direct land route from Rangoon to Kiang Hung is the one which, if feasible, must, owing to its directness, be the best; and there is no doubt, from the same cause, it would be the cheapest to construct."

The Report of Captain Williams, who was afterwards appointed to survey this route, was conclusive in its favour. He said that upwards of 250 miles, a full moiety of the entire line, would be within British territory, and the remaining portion would pass through country occupied by people who were, with their chiefs, well affected towards the British Government, though tributary to the King of Burmah. Captain Watson, another English officer, from personal examination, recommended the same line. From some inexplicable cause, the Indian Government set its face against even a survey of this route. The memorials presented to the Government simply asked for a survey of the country. They did not ask for the construction of a railway, or that any vast expenditure should be incurred, but the memorialists would have been satisfied with a single tramway. At length a man of force of character came to be Secretary of State for India, and the good bold sense of Lord Salisbury decided that a case had been made out for a survey, ordered one, and persisted in his order, notwithstanding the opposition of the Indian Government. Accordingly, in 1867, Captains Williams and Luard made a survey of 245 miles of the route up to the British frontier. Of this they found that 200 miles were good country and 45 miles would be difficult, though not to compare in difficulty with other Indian routes. In the whole 245 miles it was probable that not more than one tunnel would be required. Beyond this there remained only 250 miles to be surveyed, but the Indian Government stopped the survey. The Report of Captains Williams and Luard encouraged the belief that a railway could be made at a small cost compared with the enormous magnitude of the object to be attained, and a cost which the revenue of British Burmah would enable it easily to bear. The work would be beneficial, not only to the manufacturers and merchants of England, but to the merchants of Rangoon and the whole native population. Two towns alone, Rangoon and Moulmein contained populations, the one exceeding and the other approaching 100,000, and each had a splendid commerce. The population of British Burmah had nearly doubled within the last ten years, its revenue had doubled, and its imports and exports had increased from £5,000,000 to £10,000,000. In July, 1868, Colonel, now General, Fytche, Chief Commissioner of British Burmah, who was formerly opposed to the making of the proposed railway, but had since changed his views, wrote a despatch in which he recommended that the survey should be resumed on commercial, political, and scientific grounds, and in deference to the Chambers of Commerce. He further recommended the adoption of the line to Kiang Hung as the shortest and best line of communication with Western China. In competition with this was the Bhamo route, the one on which Captain Sladen had been directed to report. One objection to it was that it was the longer route. While the length of the lower route was only 500 miles, the Bhamo route included a distance of nearly 1,100 miles up the valley of the Irrawaddy, and then a journey across a mountainous country before China was reached. He believed the engineering difficulties of the Bhamo route would be found much greater than those of the lower route, and the political difficulties were immensely greater, obliging Captain Williams to leave Captain Sladen's party and to return. While the lower route was through British territory, the Bhamo route was through Burmah and Chinese territory; and, as far as he could judge, the advantages of the lower route were immense. At length the India Office again changed its policy for the better, and on the 29th April, this year, the Duke of Argyll, in a despatch to the Governor General of India, said—

> "Her Majesty's Government are desirous of promoting any measure which may have the ultimate effect of facilitating intercourse between India and China, with a view to the interchange of mercantile commodities and the development of the resources of the two countries. . . . . The settlement of the present question is regarded with considerable interest by large and important mercantile communities in this country, and I should be glad, therefore, if the proposal now before me, which has the support of Colonel Fytche, Chief Commissioner of British Burmah, could be carried into effect; provided that the necessary operations of the survey can be undertaken without entailing upon your Government any embarrassment or inconvenience in the shape of political complications, and if they should not involve any undue expenditure of the public money."

On behalf of the Chambers of Commerce he would say it was their wish that these conditions should be observed. They did not wish for any extravagant expenditure of public money, nor for foreign annexation, of which there were too many advocates. They wished for peace and friendly commerce; they detested war and annexation, and they recommended the adoption of prudent measures, such as the sending of an embassy to the Court of Burmah. The people of this country had so much need of fresh markets that they had a right to claim that these routes should be surveyed. They were not opposed to the Bhamo route, or any other; but they pressed for a survey of the cheapest and best route. He had simply to impress, in conclusion, upon the Government the importance of not allowing a matter of such great consequence to be any longer delayed. Since this project had first been proposed, we had seen two lines of railway thrown across the Alps,—two lines of submarine telegraph sunk across the bed of the Atlantic,—a railway constructed across the breadth of North America, ascending and descending the Rocky Mountains,—£70,000,000 spent on the railways of India,—the Isthmus of Suez pierced by a ship canal,—and the greatest geographical problem of history solved by the discovery of the sources of the Nile; and yet, whilst these wonderful enterprizes had been effected by ourselves and other nations, our Indian Government refused even to survey a short route on our own frontier, although its accomplishment would be the means of bringing us into communication with a population who would be customers to an incredible extent for the produce of the industry of England. The hon. Gentleman concluded by asking the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Survey authorized by the Secretary of State for India, and commenced in 1867, is ordered to be completed, or what is being done for the construction of a Railway or Telegraph through British Burmah to the Western Provinces of China?

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he wished strongly to urge on the Government the expediency of constructing the proposed route, which would in all not exceed in length 500 miles, and would in the main lie through our own territory. As things at present stood, we had no other inlets for our commerce with China except the three seaports included in our treaties, and in order to penetrate into the interior of the country we had to travel over thousands of miles through districts presenting considerable difficulties. There was a vast commercial population in the western and south-western provinces of China, which now carried on a large trade with Burmah, and that was the field which he desired to see opened up to English commerce. And what, he would ask, were the objections to the opening of the route? During the Government of Lord Derby Lord Cranborne stated in a letter, which he wrote on the subject, that he considered the case to have been made out for making a survey on behalf of the commerce of this country. On the 8th of December, 1866, however, the Governor General of India wrote a letter, in which he deprecated the expenditure which even a preliminary investigation would involve, stating that he believed it would lead to no satisfactory result. Yielding to the remonstrances of the Governor General of India, the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the India Office (Sir Stafford Northcote) consented to have the survey stopped. The Governor General of India had objected to it on the ground of the financial position of India, and because, in his opinion, it had no object but that of showing what the features of the country were. Now, he ventured to think that was a very important object. All the Chambers of Commerce asked was, that the Government should use the means in its power to afford them information on which they might act hereafter. For some reason or other another survey had been commenced of a line which, instead of being 500 miles, would be 1,250 miles in length, and which for a very great distance would run through the territory of the Sovereign of Burmah. The report of this route, as far as it had been surveyed, was very unfavourable. There was a third route in contemplation, which would describe two sides of a triangle, of which the base was part of the route of 500 miles which the British merchants advocated. This third line also ran through the Burman Empire. He could understand either of the longer routes—the one forming a semicircle and the other two sides of a triangle—if intended for strategic purposes, or with a view to a policy of annexation; but if a line was wanted for commercial purposes, he could not see why either one or the other of them should be countenanced by the Government. He hoped the Government would do what was asked by the Chambers of Commerce on a question so important to the commercial interests of this country.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he felt that he stood before the House in this matter rather in the capacity of a culprit, because from the speeches just delivered it was obvious that the two hon. Members charged him with having taken a retrograde step, when he filled the Office of Secretary for India, in stopping the survey directed by his noble Friend the Marquess of Salisbury. He did not think any apology was needed by hon. Members representing great mercantile constituencies for having brought the subject forward. No doubt, for the commerce of this country, the matter was one of considerable importance; and no one would be better pleased than he to see a good inland communication established between British India and China. He was anxious to say a few words in justification of the course he had adopted. In the first place, he would wish to put this before the House—that, in the consideration of this question, they should bear in mind it was one which was not only interesting to the commercial world, but was also of great interest for our Indian Empire. The Chambers of Commerce had been for a long time asking the Indian Government to undertake a survey through a country which did not belong to us, with a view to the construction of a railway. His hon. Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines) now spoke of a tramway, but he believed that a railway was what the Chambers of Commerce had been asking for. The survey commenced was one of a line from Rangoon through British Burmah and the Shan States to the western frontier of China. Was it a prudent thing to have undertaken that survey? He put aside the small matter whether the finances of India could afford the survey. He thought Lord Salisbury rightly put aside that matter by saying that the revenue of British Burmah could bear the expenditure. But were hon. Members to put this before them as if the survey were one in Yorkshire, or as if it was one through any thoroughly civilized country. The Shan States had been spoken of as if there was no difficulty in carrying a railway through them; but the Shan States, though nominally under the government of the King of Burmah, were in a continual state of rebellion against that Sovereign. No doubt the King of Burmah would have been glad to promote any enterprize which might have brought him British support in his quarrel with the Shan States; and, on the other hand, the Shans would also have been very glad if any proceeding on the part of the British Government in making a railway would have given them a title to claim assistance in enabling them to hold their own against their legitimate suzerain, the King of Burmah. The Government of India thought it was not desirable that anything of the kind should occur, and it would certainly have been a strong measure on the part of the Secretary of State for India if he had attempted in that state of things to overrule the Government of India, and had compelled them, against their own judgment, to carry on a survey which might have produced such complications. At that time there was a very considerable amount of opinion in India in favour of annexing Burmah to the British Empire, and naturally the carrying on a survey would have been exactly the sort of step which would have given countenance to the idea that the Indian Government contemplated annexation; but nothing could have been more undesirable than that such an idea should be created. All that was asked was that a survey should be carried through the country for the purpose of seeing whether it was practicable to make a railway there; but what was the use of such a proceeding, unless the Indian Government saw their way to construct a railway? Supposing the survey had been made, and that the country was found practicable for a railway, the next request would naturally have been that Government assistance should be given for the construction of one. Was it possible for any company to be formed in this country for that purpose without some assistance or guarantee from the Government, and was it likely that the British House of Commons would have sanctioned a guarantee? He put out of the question the idea that anything like an Imperial guarantee or Imperial assistance would have been given for such a railway; and, therefore, the Indian Goverment must have been applied to. Now, the back of the Indian Government was a very broad one, and he had no doubt that great pressure would have been brought to bear upon that Government to induce them to afford the required aid, but was it possible to suppose that the Government of India would have been able to give a guarantee for the suggested railway, seeing the claims which existed for railways in India and the great expense which the finances of India had to bear to give effect to the most necessary lines within the Indian territory? Lord Cranborne, when he authorized the survey, observed that he was not prepared to commit the finances of India for any railway of the kind. Such being the state of circumstances when the matter came before the Indian Council and himself, he, though aware that he might subject himself to great obloquy on the part of the commercial interests of this country if he acted on the recommendation of the Governor General of India that the survey should be stopped, yet, looking at the matter as dispassionately as he could, and having every desire to promote railway communication as far as possible between India and China, thought it right to follow the advice of the Governor General, who was responsible for the peace and prosperity of India, and to stop the survey. Nothing would give him greater pleasure than to learn that the state of circumstances had altered, and that the Secretary for India was able to undertake this work; but he pressed on the attention of the Government that it was not their duty to listen, in the first instance, to the representations of commercial bodies in this country, but it behoved them to consider the political aspect of the question, and to keep the country from entangling itself in foreign complications which might lead to difficulties and to, perhaps, war. They ought to be particularly anxious to avoid anything which would give umbrage to the neighbouring Powers of India, and anything pointing to annexation. But supposing all difficulty got over with respect to the construction of the railway, and supposing the railway made, how was it, passing through disturbed districts, to be kept open? It would be necessary to have British soldiers stationed at particular points of the line or some other mode of protection. That would be *quasi* annexation of that part of the country through which the railway passed. Unless you could see your way to some protection of that line, he was afraid they would only be opening the door to difficulties of which it would be impossible to foresee the end. The hon. Member who last spoke made some remarks on the curious fact that immediately after the survey of the southern route was put a stop to another survey was commenced by a very different route. That measure was ordered by the Government of India on their own responsibility, without any communication with the Secretary of State. But it was a route of a very different character from the one of which they were speaking. No doubt it was a much more circuitous route; but there was no idea of making a railway or any communication at all, but merely of restoring an old caravan route that had fallen into disuse. It would have been easy to revive the use of that route, and one of its advantages was that there was a direct interest on the part of the King of Burmah to encourage that route. It was a matter rather for him than for us to consider how that communication could be restored, and no doubt it would have been an advantage to us to have it restored. But that was altogether different from what was pressed upon them before, of what was called Captain Sprye's route, which was to depend on the construction of a railway through a country entirely under the dominion of the King of Burmah. They had also heard of a third route, and he could tell of a fourth—a more northerly route, by way of the Bramahputra, and which would give a more direct communication between Calcutta and China than any other. He believed it was the interest of the British Government and of the Indian Government to encourage in every possible way the improvement of the land communications between India and China. All he would press on the House was to abstain from embarrassing the Government of India by any injunctions which it might be inconvenient for that Government to comply with. It was quite right that they should have all commercial considerations impressed on them. No doubt the Secretary of State paid great respect to all that was said in that House; but he earnestly hoped the House would be cautious in not pressing on the Government of India what might be seriously embarrassing to our relations. He hoped to hear from his hon. Friend that progress was being made; nobody would rejoice more than he should at the prospect of these communications being effected.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, he would be very glad to explain to his hon. Friend (Mr. Baines) as briefly and clearly as he could how this matter stood, for he well knew that it excited in some of the Lancashire and Yorkshire towns an interest altogether disproportionate to its real importance, and he had no doubt that a little less reticence a few years ago would have prevented the growth of many wild hopes. The attention of the present Secretary of State in Council was first called to this matter by a despatch from the Governor General of India, enclosing a correspondence between the Chief Commissioner of British Burmah and the Government of India. The Chief Commissioner of British Burmah had conceived a project for carrying the telegraph from Rangoon to Kiang Hung, a Shan city close to the frontier of China, with the view to its being extended right across China to the eastern seaboard. He need not say that this proposal met with favour neither at the hands of the Government of India, nor at the hands of the Secretary of State in Council; but the correspondence which had been lately laid on the table of the House raised other questions, and more especially whether it would or would not be desirable to continue the survey which, wisely begun under the orders of Lord Salisbury, was wisely stopped, after a change of circumstances, by the order of his right hon. Friend opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote), at the urgent entreaty of Sir John Lawrence and his Council. The result of long and very careful consideration was a despatch to India, from which he would read an extract—

> "Her Majesty's Government are desirous of promoting any measure which may have the ultimate effect of facilitating intercourse between India and China, with a view to the interchange of mercantile commodities and the development of the resources of the two countries, and they are anxious also to advance, by such explorations as are here suggested, the interests of geographical science. The settlement of the present question is regarded with considerable interest by large and important mercantile communities in this country, and I should be glad, therefore, if the proposal now before me, which has the support of Colonel Fytche, the Chief Commissioner of British Burmah, could be carried into effect, provided that the necessary operations of the survey can be undertaken without entailing upon your Government any embarrassment or inconvenience in the shape of political complications, and if they should not involve any undue expenditure of the public money. With respect to the latter point, I should wish to receive from you some estimate of the probable expense."

This question of communication between Rangoon and Kiang Hung divided itself into three parts—1. What is the character and what are the commercial capabilities of that part of our own Burmese territory through which the projected railway or telegraph is to be made? 2. What is the character of the country between our own frontier and the frontier of China? And, 3. What is the character and condition of that part of China which would be reached by the projected route? Only two plans had been suggested for taking the railway across our own territory which he need notice. The first of these was the line surveyed up to the frontier by Messrs. Williams and Luard. Their official Report had been laid before Parliament, and might be summed up by saying that the line taken as a whole would be a difficult but not an extraordinarily difficult one. The first part would be very easy, the second less so, the third very arduous. The general character of the country as described to him by Captain Luard, who was now in England, was a good deal like Wales, but with the hills higher in many places. The local traffic of this portion of the line would be absolutely trifling. A little rice might come down to the coast, but that would be all. From the point where the survey of Williams and Luard stopped to the Takau Ferry, on the Salween, the country had not been regularly surveyed, but we knew a good deal about it. There would be difficulties of various kinds — great difficulties, but difficulties in no way insuperable, if a great object were to be attained. The other plan for getting a communication across our own territory which he would mention was to go from Rangoon northward to Tounghoo, and from there to reach the Takau Ferry. There were a good many advantages about this line, and even if it never got further than Tounghoo it would be useful for local purposes; but it was far too early to decide between the two lines. It would be long before either of them would be proposed by anyone willing to find the money; and in the meantime they need not be jealous of each other. He now came to the second part of the journey —to the question how we were to get across the Eastern Shan States from the Takau Ferry to Kiang Hung. About the first portion of this line extremely little was known; indeed, hardly anything at all. At Kiang Hung the direct route from the Takau Ferry would fall in with the route followed a generation ago by Captain M'Leod on his journey from Moulmein to Kiang Hung. That officer kept a good deal to the southward of the route last proposed until he reached Kiang Hung. His experiences—and, as far as he (Mr. Grant Duff) knew, he was the only European who had reached Kiang Hung from British Burmah—were not very encouraging. They might be read at length in his diary which was about to be laid upon the table of the House; but he might perhaps be allowed to give a summary of them from his own lips, for he had been good enough to allow him to vouch, on the authority of his name, for the following statements made to him (Mr. Grant Duff) in conversation. First, then, the Shan States which he traversed were very thinly peopled. For days and days together he journeyed through a mere jungle without meeting a soul. The mountain ranges were numerous, high, and precipitous, and the only roads to be found were often the beds of dried-up torrents. The people were mere barbarians, anxious to trade, no doubt, in their own small way, but with very little to exchange, and the so-called caravans that came down from the frontiers of China were on a very small scale. General M'Leod had never countenanced the idea that a railway or telegraph could be made from Rangoon to Kiang Hung in our generation with the slightest advantage or profit, though of course, like all reasonable men, he was in favour of exploration, provided that exploration could be carried out without great expense, sacrifice of life, or political inconvenience. He (Mr. Grant Duff) did not himself believe that the expense need be great, and he did not believe that if the survey were to be carried out by our own officers there was much danger of any considerable sacrifice of life or of getting into difficulties either with the rulers of the petty Shan States themselves or with the King of Burmah. That, however, was a mere individual opinion formed after some study of the subject, which he offered for what it was worth. Well, but when we should have got to Kiang Hung and were looking across the Cambodia river to the Chinese post on the other side, we should be looking at a country about much of which we had just about as authentic information as we had about the country on the other side of the Styx. He could imagine that he saw some enthusiast for this scheme, on reading what he (Mr. Grant Duff) was now saying, rush to his shelves and indignantly opening a thick pamphlet by the prime mover in this project turn to the pages where information about the huge province of Yunan, as this part of China was called, had been industriously collected. Well, but what did it all amount to? That in this enormous region there was a certain amount of wealth and there were a certain number of valuable products. Who ever doubted it? But what did we know of the local distribution of that wealth and those products which could lead us to believe that they would find an outlet by Kiang Hung? Was not the natural outlet of that province the great valley of the Yangtze, or the Canton river? And why should its products come wandering over the high rough region which we knew lay to the north of Kiang Hung in order to seek an outlet towards the Bay of Bengal? The amount of recent information about the province of Yunan possessed by anyone in Western Europe, except the survivors of the French exploring expedition which lately ascended the Cambodia river, was small indeed. Of the information acquired by these gentlemen very little, mere fragments, he might say, had become *publici juris*, and he was afraid some time would pass before the work on which they were engaged would appear, for it was to be, he understood, on a very extensive scale. His belief about the Yunan of the present day, formed from such morsels of knowledge as he could obtain, was that it was a large, and in parts, prosperous province, but that even in the best times most of its south-western trade flowed down to Burmah by Bhamo and the Irrawaddy, not by Kiang Hung. That trade was respectable—say £500,000 a year—till in 1855 a great insurrection broke out against the Chinese authority among its Mahommedan population, since which time the through trade from Northern China was dead, and nothing survived but a local traffic of no importance. Further, he was assured by General M'Leod, who reached, as he had already mentioned, the Chinese border at Kiang Hung, that in that part of Yunan the population was extremely poor. No doubt it was a more civilized region altogether than the Shan States, but it was as far as possible from being a region which it was worth going through the Shan States to get at. If any member of any of the numerous Chambers of Commerce who had sent memorials to any of the Departments of Government about this matter could give one single scrap of first-hand information about South-western China or about any of the countries between British Burmah and South-western China, the Government would be most grateful for it; but if the Chambers of Commerce, into whose hands the Government was most anxious to play, made themselves mere speaking trumpets through which a projector shouted facts and views with which the Government was perfectly familiar, they could not be surprised if the Government merely acknowledged their letters, wondering that British merchants and manufacturers, with all the world before them, should have so little to do as to be able to find time for so dull an amusement or so vain a labour. He would be very sorry to be understood to discourage the idea that a profitable trade might one day be established with South-western China through our Indian dominions. He held the diametrically opposite opinion, and believed that the day would come when we should have first a small trade, then improved roads, and finally, for all he knew, even a railway from Rangoon to Kiang Hung, but that last only in the far future. He thought we should see a renewal and improvement of the trade down the Irrawaddy, which, as he had said, died out in 1855, and he had a very strong impression that it might be possible to have a trade from Calcutta through Munipore to Bhamo and Talifoo. Further, he believed the day would come when we might be able to communicate through the absolutely unknown country between Sudiya in Assam and Bathang, and that we might have consuls in at least four great towns of Western China. All that, however, was for our children and grandchildren to carry out. The duty of this generation was only to explore these outlying regions, and to make straight the paths for our successors. There were two kinds of projectors in the world—those who saw for what the times were ripe and led the way to it—and those who, neglecting the real work of their own age, kept querulously anticipating the work of the age that was to follow, being born, as Lammenais would have said—"with repeaters in their heads which were always striking the hour." Some friends in the North of England had in this matter of the route between Rangoon and Western China fallen, to their detriment and to the sorrow of the Government, into the hands of the latter kind of projector. In conclusion, he would once more specially direct the attention of the hon. Gentlemen who were interested in this matter to the words of the despatch from which he read an extract. The two motives of the Government in directing the survey to be continued were—first, to extend geographical science and our acquaintance with the frontier lands of our own territory; secondly, to oblige the many mercantile communities which had addressed the Government on the subject. He admitted that it was not satisfactory, after having held Pegu for some sixteen years, that we really knew as little of the countries beyond it as we did some sixteen years before we possessed it. The French, with a far inferior base of operations, and more than twice the distance to traverse, had passed through Yunan, visiting both its Chinese and its Mussulman capital. That was greatly to their credit, and he hoped, before long, we should, through an increase of friendly and confidential intercourse with our allies at Pekin, Bangkok, and Mandalay, know the Indo-Chinese peninsula much better than we did now; but this particular question of communication with China through Rangoon, which seemed, so to speak, a star of the first magnitude to many in the North of England, seemed to the Government, considered as a project for the immediate benefit of commerce, a star of the fifteenth magnitude—should he not rather say a mere will-o'-the-wisp?—which, if we were to follow it to the neglect of our own real business in India would lead us only into trouble and disgrace.

GAMBIA — PRISONERS IN BATHURST GAOL.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BUXTON, who had given notice to move an Address for Copy of a Petition and other Documents forwarded by the Merchants and other Inhabitants of Bathurst, Gambia, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, relative to the treatment of Prisoners in the Gaol, said, he wished to call attention to the extraordinary proceedings of Admiral Patey, the Administrator of the Gambia, as regarded his treatment of the negro prisoners in the gaol, and he must observe that the statement he was about to make rested on unimpeachable authority. He should quote only from the evidence given by the gaoler himself, by the head turnkey, and Dr. Jeans, the surgeon of the gaol. A coroner's inquest was held upon one of the prisoners who had died, and the verdict of the jury was that his death had been caused by shot drill and treadmill labour. Upon this an inquiry was instituted, and the evidence he should quote was given by the persons he had referred to, but was entirely corroborated by that of the prisoners themselves, and he must say that the case against Admiral Patey appeared to be so strong that the Government was bound not to let the matter rest, but to consider whether he was not wholly unfit for his very responsible and important situation at the Gambia. The gaoler showed in the first place, that the Governor, Admiral Patey, had the entire control of the gaol. It was altogether his doing that the prisoners were subjected to the treatment which he (Mr. Buxton) was about to describe. Admiral Patey regulated the hard labour without reference to the sheriff or the visiting justices. The facts proved at the inquiry were these:—The prisoners had two meals in the day—namely, some boiled rice at ten o'clock, and a very small allowance of bread and meat at five o'clock. But the food was stated by the surgeons to be insufficient, and was far below that given to prisoners in any well-managed gaol. However, they had their second meal at five o'clock, and were then locked up in their cells. At about half-past five the next morning they were woke up, and went to work. They were at hard labour from that time until they came in at half-past nine, having then been 16½ hours without food, and even then they were not allowed to go to their breakfast, but were put to shot drill for half-an-hour. The shot drill was thus described. It was done in a circle. The men were marched round, at each four paces putting down and taking up a ball and carrying it. The shot was a 24-pounder.

> "At first," said the gaoler, "we had only 18-pounders, but Admiral Patey said they were too light, and caused us to get 24-pounders. The prisoners marched round, putting down and taking up the balls continuously during the drill."

Dr. Waters, the Staff Assistant Surgeon, justly says:—

> "I think the prison diet insufficient. I think also that a man who has been sixteen and a-half hours without food is not fit to be put on shot drill."

Evidence to exactly the same effect was given by the colonial surgeon, Dr. Jeans, and indeed it obviously was outrageous that a man should be put to this very severe work after being from sixteen and a-half hours to seventeen hours without food, and that food itself very insufficient. After the shot drill was over the men were at length allowed to go to their breakfast of plain boiled rice. They were then sent to work again until half-past four, and were then put upon the treadmill, and the gaoler said—

> "There is no board on our treadmill on which a prisoner can rest if tired, and if he relaxes he would fall down. . . . Sometimes they do fall down. This happens frequently. When some drop down I put on others. . . . On the treadmill the prisoners fall down sweating, appearing very much tired. All prisoners sentenced to hard labour are put to shot drill and treadmill without distinction and without reference to their offences. The cook and hospital attendant have to go. My orders are to put any prisoners sentenced to hard labour to shot drill and treadmill. If a prisoner is sentenced to seven days' hard labour in default of payment of a fine, he is treated the same as a felon. The prisoners are put to hard labour as I have described it without any examination of their physical fitness."

The gaoler seemed to have been strongly impressed with the cruelty of the system, and as soon as Admiral Patey went away on leave he stopped the shot drill and treadmill labour; but as soon as the Admiral returned they were resumed, in addition to the ordinary labour. The attention of the gaoler was also called to an entry in the diary—"May 9, Whipped six prisoners." He said—

> "They were tied up and flogged with a cat. The Governor did not fix the number of lashes, but told me to tell the sheriff to give John Day and — Jie a good flogging."

Dr. Jeans, the colonial surgeon, was examined with reference to these floggings, and he said that Day was flogged though he had just come out of a very dangerous illness. Dr. Jeans added that he had felt special interest for Day "because he had been excessively sick." He (Mr. Buxton) had no wish to detain the House, but the brief statement he had made was, he thought, quite enough to show that great and unreasonable cruelties had been exercised upon the prisoners in Bathurst Gaol, and he trusted the Secretary for the Colonies would make further inquiry into the case and would publish any correspondence that bore upon the subject.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, he was persuaded that the state of things upon the West Coast of Africa demanded the attention of the Government. Some years ago he had pressed upon the present Secretary of State for War, at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies, the hardship inflicted upon a gentleman of good position practising as a member of the bar at Trinidad, who had been recommended by three successive Governors for the Attorney Generalship of Sierra Leone, and had also filled the position of Acting Chief Justice, and yet was degraded in consequence of a misunderstanding with the Governor. He would not trouble the House with the details of the case now, but would be glad to mention the matter privately to the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON said, he regretted that the whole subject of the West African Settlements had not been brought under consideration. A case at Cape Coast Castle had come under his knowledge in which, in consequence of some very trifling dispute, a gentleman of good position had been confined in a most filthy dungeon. He regretted to find among his hon. Friends below the Gangway a desire to restrict British operations upon the coast of Africa. If the snail-like policy of withdrawal was to be adopted, he trusted the full-grown prosperous colonies would be allowed to shift for themselves in the first instance, and that we should not give up our protection and our influence over the native races, and in doing so abandon some of the most glorious traditions of the British Empire.

Mr. MONSELL said, he hoped his hon. Friend who had spoken last would give him the particulars of the case to which he referred—he would then cause inquiries to be made with reference to it. His hon. Friend opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler) had also mentioned a quarrel on the West Coast of Africa. To what cause it was to be attributed, whether to a tropical epidemic, to something peculiar in the character of the West Coast, or to the contact with barbarous races he was unable to say, but the officials upon that coast certainly seemed to spend a vast amount of time in fighting with each other. Statements very similar to those read by the hon. Member for East Surrey (Mr. Buxton) had been received at the Colonial Office; but unfortunately those statements were founded on investigations conducted entirely by persons who were the known enemies of Admiral Patey. The complaint against the Admiral resolved itself into a charge, not of having introduced any improper system of punishments, for the hard labour and shot drill were believed to be perfectly proper in themselves by the Director of Convict Prisons, to whom the matter had been referred, but of having introduced this system without taking those precautions which the climate and the circumstances of the persons to be subjected to the punishment required. The Government had done precisely what his hon. Friend suggested. In the first place, they referred this statement to the Director of Convict Prisons, and then addressed the Governor-in-Chief of the West African Colonies, directing him to have inquiry made, and at once to remedy the grievances complained of, if any such were found to exist, to inquire further as to the conduct of the administration and the management of the gaol. To that letter no reply had yet been received, probably on account of the lamentable visitation of cholera at Gambia, one of the most severe, he believed, upon record. In meeting this visitation, those who had brought complaints against Admiral Patey took no part whatever, but held their hands. Admiral Patey, on the other hand, and one or two other gentlemen, exerted themselves in a manner deserving the highest praise. They buried the dead with their own hands, and went about among the suffering, and did all that lay in their power to relieve them; and this, certainly, had led him to believe that there could not be that inhumanity in Admiral Patey's disposition which was alleged in the complaints about the gaols. With one remark made by his hon. Friend (Mr. A. Johnston) he could not agree. Considering the difficulty there was in administering properly the affairs of these colonies, in contending with the climate, and in controlling the various officials—difficulties which, he believed, had been felt quite as strongly by former Governments as by the present—he certainly thought that if we could manage to draw in our horns on that coast, and get rid of some of our West African settlements, it would be a decided advantage. The necessity which at one time existed of keeping up these establishments in connection with the efforts for the suppression of the slave trade no longer existed; and he believed their relinquishment now would be attended with advantage to this country, and would not be injurious to the settlements themselves. As far as he could see, the general tendency of things upon that coast was far more to barbarize the Europeans than it was to civilize the natives.

CURRENCY LAWS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. DELAHUNTY, who had given notice of a Motion upon this subject, which the rules of the House would not allow him to move, said the object which he had in view was to do something which might tend to resuscitate in Ireland manufactures yielding profitable employment to the people. If manufactures could be established in Ireland, the people, being employed, would be perfectly satisfied, and the misery and distress that at present existed in that country would disappear. He regretted that the rules of the House prevented him from bringing the subject under their attention in another shape, but he hoped, on a future occasion, to bring forward a Motion for the purpose of inducing the Government to deal justly with Ireland, as far as the currency was concerned. Ireland had suffered much during the last thirty or forty years, and her population, instead of being 13,000,000 as it should have been, allowing for the natural ratio of increase, was only 5,250,000, or exactly what it was in 1801. The famines that had occurred in that country were not owing to a short supply of food, but to the want of employment consequent upon the absence of a circulating medium. In 1822, in 1828, and in 1848, the periods of the greatest distress in that country, food was abundant and cheap, but the people had no money to buy it in consequence of the contraction of the circulation. He hoped the Government would take this matter into their earliest consideration, and would bring in a Bill to assimilate the Currency Laws of Ireland to those of other parts of the United Kingdom.

MR. AYRTON said, the question brought forward by the hon. Member was a very important one, and at some appropriate time would receive the careful attention of the Government. In the meantime, however, matters of most pressing importance demanded their immediate attention, and would prevent them from giving it that consideration which it would otherwise have demanded. He hoped that the step taken by the hon. Member would be duly appreciated in Ireland.

Main Question "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put and *agreed to*

WAYS AND MEANS.

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there be issued and applied to the Service of the year ending the 31st day of March 1870, the sum of £798,132 17*s.* 9*d.*, being the Surplus of Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding years.

(2.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the sum of £21,746,684 2*s.* 3*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*.

EAST INDIA LOAN BILL.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to enable the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise a sum not exceeding £8,000,000, in the United Kingdom for the Service of the Government of India, on the credit of the Revenues of India."

Resolution *agreed to:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. GRANT DUFF, and Mr. STANSFELD.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 251.]

HARBOUR OF GALLE LOAN BILL.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to empower the Public Works Loan Commissioners, out of any monies for the time being at their disposal for the purpose of Harbours, to advance to the Government of the Colony of Ceylon, a sum or sums not exceeding in the whole £250,000, to be applied in improving and fortifying the Harbour of Galle in the said Colony."

Resolution *agreed to:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. GRANT DUFF, and Mr. STANSFELD.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 250.]

PLANS FOR NEW DINING ROOMS, &c.

Select Committee *appointed*, "to consider Plans for New Refreshment and Dining Rooms for both Houses of Parliament, and for Improvements in the Ladies' Gallery of the House of Commons:—Lord JOHN MANNERS, Mr. BOUVERIE, Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SMITH, Colonel FRENCH, and Mr. LAYARD:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum." — (*Mr. Layard.*)

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 31*st July*, 1869.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Plans for New Dining Rooms, &c., Lord John Manners *discharged*, Colonel Wilson-Patten *added*.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [July 30] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*Resolutions* [July 30] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*.

Committee — Report — Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) (*re-comm.*) [238]; Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment * [227]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [245].

Considered as amended—Basses Lights (Ceylon) * [224].

Third Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * [225]; Militia (Ireland) * [222]; Militia Pay *; Basses Lights (Ceylon) * [224]; Public Works (Ireland) * [202]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment * [208]; Accounts, &c. Presentation * [240], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Land Tax Law Amendment * [188].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS) (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen.*)

[BILL 238.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 21, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 22. (Power to levy consolidated rate).

MR. W. H. SMITH proposed a proviso, the effect of which would be to secure that the incidence of the rates, as they now fell upon the owners or the occupiers respectively, should not be altered by the operation of this Bill.

MR. AYRTON said, he believed that this object was secured already in other parts of the Bill. He would, however, consult the draftsman, and if the object were not sufficiently secured he would take care that it was so done in bringing up the Report.

MR. W. M. TORRENS said, he thought the clause had better be postponed. He would suggest that the whole consolidated rate should be divided into equal parts between the owners and occupiers.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 23 to 33, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 34 (Additional borrowing powers of board).

MR. J. LOWTHER moved the omission of sub-section 1, and observed that the Committee were now asked to grant a fund to complete the metropolitan drainage scheme. Opinions were by no means unanimous as to the success attending these works. A memorial had been presented to the House from Barking and other places, the health of whose inhabitants had been affected by the scheme, and he thought that they should not vote more money for the work while it was undergoing investigation.

MR. AYRTON observed that the proposal of the hon. Gentleman was somewhat like that of a man who, after spending a great deal of money in building a house, objected to give the last finishing touch to enable him to live in it. They had spent £4,000,000 in carrying the drainage to a certain point. A small portion of the scheme was yet incomplete. That portion was not at all connected with the outfall, but with the internal drainage of the metropolis. When the rate-payers were taxed for a work they were entitled to receive the benefit of it, and it would be an act of gross injustice not to give them the benefit of the completion of the scheme, merely because there was some difference of opinion amongst the philosophers on the subject.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he would withdraw his Amendment on the understanding that no further expenditure on the outfall drainage was proposed to be sanctioned.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

MR. AYRTON *moved*, after Clause 34, to insert a new clause (Loans by board to managers of Metropolitan Asylum District).

Clause *agreed to.*

SIR WILLIAM TITE *moved* to insert a new clause (Investment by trustees in stock).

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE suggested that it would be more convenient if the discussion upon this clause were taken upon the Report, because it was desirable that it should be debated in a full House—seeing that it involved a general principle. The clause not only affected the particular stock to be created, but the whole principle upon which trustees were to deal with trust money. That was a point which demanded the most serious consideration, and he thought more time should be given for that purpose.

MR. CRAWFORD agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the discussion should be postponed. He did not wish to put any difficulty in the way of the Metropolitan Board of Works raising this money; but this clause would authorize trustees to invest in this stock, though an investment of such a nature had never been contemplated. The question was not one that they could consider at this time; but, if it was considered at all, it should be considered in a Bill affecting the duties of powers of trustees.

MR. AYRTON admitted the force of these remarks, and expressed a hope that the hon. Baronet (Sir William Tite) would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. T. CHAMBERS denied that any general principle was raised by the clause. The question merely was whether trustees should have the power of investing in this particular stock. He hoped, therefore, that the Amendment, if not insisted upon at present, would be brought up again at a subsequent stage.

DR. BREWER said, that even the Three per Cents did not furnish so material a guarantee as this stock would furnish. If facilities for investment in the stock were not afforded the Bill would be worthless.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. W. M. TORRENS called attention to the proposed sale by the Metropolitan Board of twenty acres of land purchased for the creation of a park at Finsbury. The sale for building purposes of this land out of the small acreage available would leave the park a mockery and a sham. The Metropolitan Board proposed in the same way to lease land devoted to the Southwark Park. Now, Parliament had declared that a certain quantity of land should be appropriated for the purposes of these parks, and in order to carry out their views he proposed the following clause:—

> "That it shall not be lawful for the Metropolitan Board of Works to sell or let, whether on lease or otherwise, any portion of the lands now vested in said Board for the purpose of a park or other place of recreation."

Clause (Park lands vested in the Metropolitan Board of Works,) — (*Mr. Torrens,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

MR. AYRTON said, the question was, how much money contributed by the metropolis generally should be devoted for parks situated in two districts of the metropolis, and that question must necessarily be decided by the Board which represented the whole metropolis. The point raised by his hon. Friend had really nothing whatever to do with the subject-matter of this Bill, the object of which was merely to arrange for the debt of the metropolis at large. It was wholly foreign to the measure, and as far as legislation was concerned it would be an impropriety to introduce it into the Bill. If there was anything improper in the Bill giving the Metropolitan Board of Works power over these parks, that should be remedied by a Bill brought in by the local board for this purpose next year. He objected to this clause being introduced into a Bill brought in for a very different purpose.

MR. LOCKE said, this was a question which demanded the serious consideration of the Committee. Supposing a Bill were introduced on the subject next year, it would be of very little use, inasmuch as by that time the Board of Works might have the land disposed of and built upon. The subject was not foreign to the Bill, as the 42nd clause related to the powers of the Metropolitan Board in respect of certain lands. The question was, whether the Board of Works should be empowered to build on land which had been bought, under the sanction of Parliament, for the recreation of the people; and his hon. Friend (Mr. Torrens) had seized upon the right moment for dealing with this question. In all large towns throughout the country it was absolutely necessary to preserve open spaces by every possible means, and that should not be done by sacrificing the beauty of a park, when once the ground was obtained for one, and by taking portions out of it for purposes foreign to those of a park. The same question arose at Southwark, and he hoped the House would put an end to such a system by adopting the clause of his hon. Friend.

Sir WILLIAM TITE said, this question had been fully discussed on a former occasion. Some years ago it had been arranged that a park should be created at Finsbury, the Government contributing £60,000, and the Metropolitan Board finding the remaining half. But the House of Commons protested against the application of public money for the purposes of a park at Finsbury, and Lord Palmerston was compelled to withdraw the proposal he had made, leaving the Metropolitan Board to find the whole of the money. They had scheduled 240 acres, but it was impossible for them to find the means of buying this land; so they bought 130 acres. The clauses enabling the Board to deal with the surplus land were in the Act itself, and Parliament had given the Board power first to offer this land, under certain conditions, to the original owners, and if they did not take to it the land might be sold otherwise. As to Bermondsey Park, he did not believe that any decision had been come to by the Board with respect to the lease of any portion of the land. As a member of the Metropolitan Board, he had voted against the sale of any part of the Finsbury Park, but it was a question on which there might be a fair difference of opinion, and he had been out-voted. It must be remembered that the Metropolitan Board was composed of representatives of the whole metropolis, and that they not only had to buy the land but to lay out and maintain the park at a considerable annual expenditure. In such a Bill as this such a clause was entirely out of place.

Mr. HOLMS urged the Committee to protect the remainder of the land bought for Finsbury Park, and referred to the sale of a portion of Victoria Park, since which time the inhabitants of the borough he represented had been continually desiring that that land, or what remained of it, should be got back for the purpose of the park.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON said, he had surveyed the ground, which was semicircular, and what the Metropolitan Board of Works proposed to do was to cut ten acres out of the whole frontage of the park.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he hoped the Government would give way. It was unreasonable to take away the best part of the park as the Metropolitan Board proposed.

Mr. AYRTON reminded the Committee that the parishes concerned in these parks at Finsbury and Southwark had been parties to a Bill for acquiring certain land for the purposes of the parks, on condition that a portion of that land should be sold or let in order to recoup the Board a portion of the cost. The parishes now wanted the whole of the land; but such a change in the conditions of the arrangement would be a wrong to the whole of the metropolitan rate-payers, and he did not see how, if such a clause were inserted, the Bill could proceed.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS denied that his constituents were asking for anything new. They were merely asking Parliament to make good its own words.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 40; Noes 34: Majority 6.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dodson, Bill to apply a sum, out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means, to the Service of the year ending the 31st day of March 1870, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Ayrton.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Four o'clock till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 2nd August, 1869.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Despatch of Business in Parliament.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Education* (259); Basses Lights, Ceylon,* (254); Public Works (Ireland)* (255); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment* (256); Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul)* (246); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (251); Militia (Ireland)* (252); Militia Pay*; Accounts, &c. Presentation* (253); Nitro Glycerine* (245); Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* (257); Criminal Lunatics* (247); Clerks of Assize* (248); Railways Abandonment* (249); Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (250).

Second Reading—Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds (215); Seeds Adulteration (242); Land Tax Commissioners Names* (158); Dublin Freemen Commission (210).

Committee — Fisheries (Ireland) (236); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (230).

Committee — *Report* — Civil Offices (Pensions)* (157); Millbank Prison* (234); Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) (226); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* (136); Straits Settlements* (231).

Report—Evidence Amendment* (239-260); Contagious Diseases (Animals)* (240-261); Jamaica Loans* (204); Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal* (241).

Third Reading—Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks* (211); Contagious Diseases* (221); Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment* (238); Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c.* (209); Valuation of Property (Metropolis)* (229); Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment* (232); Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment* (235), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Diplomatic Salaries, &c. [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 43]; Greenwich Hospital [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 44]; Poor Law Union Loans [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 45]; Debts of Deceased Persons [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 46]; High Constables Office Abolition, &c. [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 47]; Companies Clauses Act (1863) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 48]; Fines and Fees Collection [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 49]; Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 50]; Municipal Franchise [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 55]; Endowed Schools [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 56]; County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act (1868) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 51]; Shipping Dues Exemption Act (1867) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 52]; Cinque Ports Act Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 53]; Seamen's Clothing [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 57]; Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 54].

COURTS OF JUSTICE SALARIES AND FUNDS BILL—(No. 215.)

(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that its object was to transfer funds now standing to the credit of the Accountant General and the Accountant in Bankruptcy to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt. The Commissioners would cancel stock representing these funds, and replace it by a book debt. These funds might be classed under three heads —1, funds representing investments for suitors in Chancery, standing in their own names and bearing interest for their benefit; 2, funds belonging to suitors, invested, however, not by their own desire but by the court, and bearing interest; and 3, funds consisting of fees, accumulations of interest, and so forth. Now, the Bill did not interfere with the first class, but transferred the second and third classes to the National Debt Commissioners, the funds of the Court of Bankruptcy being dealt with in the same manner. The salaries and pensions of Judges would henceforth be charged on the Consolidated Fund, while the minor salaries and expenses of the courts would be charged on the Votes, and would be subject to the annual review of Parliament. The Bill would put an end to much complication, and he hoped their Lordships would give it a second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

LORD ST. LEONARDS said, he had always been opposed to the Government putting its hand on this fund, and saw no reason for the application of any portion of it, either to the building of new Common Law Courts or to the reduction of the National Debt. It was true that no individual could say "So much of that fund is mine;" but it had been contributed by suitors in equity, and suitors in that court as a class ought from time to time to have the benefit of it. As to the indemnity to be given to suitors out of the Consolidated Fund, that fund could not be got at except through the Votes of the House of Commons, and it was moreover greatly overcharged, while various Acts of Parliament provided that certain claims should have priority over all others. He once knew a gentleman who locked up his property in Chancery for the express purpose that it might be made secure for his children; but if this

Bill passed no one but an idiot would take such a course. It made the Treasury the master of the Court of Chancery for all time to come; and its object was not merely to take the £4,000,000 now available, but to enable the Treasury to apply to the Court of Chancery whenever there was supposed to be a surplus, and to claim that surplus in order to appropriate it to the reduction of the National Debt. He saw no reason why the court should be tied hand and foot by the Treasury, nor why Parliament should, at one fell swoop, seize upon this fund. The administration of justice ought to be free, and it was unbecoming a great nation first to exact these payments from suitors, and then to apply £1,000,000 of the amount to the expense of building new Courts for other suitors, and now to confiscate £4,000,000 for the National Debt. The fund ought to be applied for the benefit of suitors themselves, whose fund it was, by the reduction or abolition of fees. In 1852 he had reduced the charges in the Court of Chancery by means of this fund, and he had hoped, if he remained in Office, to enable suitors in equity to enter that court without payment of the heavy charges to which they were liable. If this Bill passes there can no longer be any reduction of the taxation. The building new Courts for all suitors, and the reduction of the National Debt were national objects, to which the nation at large should contribute. Independently, moreover, of the objections to the principle of the Bill, their Lordships ought to reject it on the ground of time. It was introduced into the House of Commons on the 23rd of April, but it did not reach this House till the 23rd of July—almost the last week of the Session. The other House had thus several months allowed them for its consideration, and it was clear that their Lordships could not give sufficient consideration to it at this advanced period of the Session.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months.")—(*The Lord St. Leonards.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had great satisfaction in hearing his noble and learned Friend (Lord St. Leonards) state so clearly his views with reference to this Bill, and to the administration of justice in the Court of Chancery without fee or payment by the suitors. For a very long time, and up to 1865, when an entire change was made in the principle on which this fund had been hitherto dealt with, he himself shared the hope that, in a very few years, when the compensations to clerks and others fell in, there would be an opportunity of so administering justice to suitors in the Court of Chancery that while, of course, litigants would have to act in the usual manner with regard to the employment of solicitors and others, no fee would be payable to the court. But, in 1865, a scheme was brought forward for the construction of new Courts of Law and Equity; and, though he concurred in the necessity of providing new Courts, he then protested against applying funds paid into court by suitors in chancery, and the profits made upon those funds, to providing buildings wherein to transact the business of other courts than those of equity. However, his protest was in vain—it was determined that the Suitors' Fund in the Court of Chancery should be applied to that purpose, and henceforth it appeared to him hopeless to expect that the fees would ever be done away with. That being so, any objection which he might have felt to the principle of this Bill, anterior to that period, appeared to him to be swept away. There was, he thought, a clear answer to the objections taken to the course proposed respecting these particular funds—namely, the cash paid into court by suitors as distinguished from the stock which stood to their credit. The matter might be easily explained. Suitors in the Court of Chancery might desire to have the money paid into court invested and carried to the credit of the particular cause; but, in many instances, they were not disposed to ask for this. Sometimes, for example, the cause was likely to be disposed of speedily, the sum might speedily be wanted in cash, and suitors did not desire to go to the expense of buying and selling out. In other cases, suitors were afraid of investing in the funds, with the possibility of a fall in value, and they, therefore, simply paid their money into court. In these cases, and in suits for the administration of estates in Chancery, the court was used by suitors simply as a private banker. Now, all the money so paid in was money which the suitor was only entitled to demand again in cash to the amount placed to his credit. But the Court of Chancery had felt itself at liberty to do with this cash just what bankers did when they had large sums standing to the credit of their various customers. Whether the court had herein acted properly or improperly was not the question; but he believed the practice had resulted very much to the advantage of all concerned. The Court of Chancery said—"We will not let this money lie idle; we will invest it, and thereby obtain interest upon the money, holding it as a fund out of which we may answer the call for any cash payments, the principal and the accumulated interest being sufficient to meet any possible deficiency caused by a fall in the price of stock, and being sufficient also to meet the cash demands of the suitor or customer." Accordingly, the cash had been from time to time invested in stock, the income of which was again invested, and the profits represented the sum of between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000, now proposed to be carried over to the Treasury, and applied in reduction of the National Debt. The simple fact was, that henceforth the Treasury meant to undertake the banking for the suitors, instead of the Court of Chancery. This stock, *qua* stock, in no way belonged to the suitors. It was the stock purchased by the gross amount of the cash lying in the Court of Chancery to the credit of all the suitors, each suitor being credited with the special debt due to him. But if you deposited £1,000 with your bankers you could not afterwards go and ask for the mortgage on which that money had been lent or the shares which it had purchased. You would ask for your £1,000, and to that you would be entitled. In the same way the Court of Chancery sold out stock to produce the specific sum which was wanted, and when that was done the suitor was satisfied and the court retained the profit. From year to year dividends were accruing upon this stock, and in those dividends the suitor had no interest. There were, in fact, two funds. One, consisting of the investments of the suitors' cash payments, was known as Fund A; and the income derived from Fund A was called Fund B. It was from that fund that the £1,000,000 was taken which had been applied towards the building of the Law Courts. He repeated that he should have been glad in 1865 to see the sum applied in reducing the fees payable by suitors; but it had not been so applied, and the Government had undertaken all the responsibility which arose in connection with it. The Treasury now said, with regard to the remaining stock, that they would henceforth be the bankers of suitors in equity, claiming that any profit accruing therefrom should belong to the State. There were no individuals in the Court of Chancery to whom the profit could belong; and who was entitled to it, except the State? The Treasury therefore said — "As that is so in form at present, let it be so in substance." Nothing was really being given away to which the suitors had a right to look, and their security would be just as good in having a charge upon the Consolidated Fund as it now was in having a charge upon £2,500,000 of stock. The credit of the country would be pledged to satisfy the demands of suitors for cash paid by them into court, and the Government bound themselves to pay to the suitor, upon the direction of the court, the money to which he was entitled — always keeping the sum of £300,000 to the credit of the Accountant-General in Chancery for the purpose of satisfying current demands. The whole difference, in fact, would be that henceforth the suitors would have the State for their bankers instead of the court. His noble and learned Friend (Lord St. Leonards) said the Bill ought to have been before their Lordships earlier in the Session, and he (the Lord Chancellor) was anxious to explain how the delay had arisen. This Bill, though it originated with the Treasury, was submitted to him, and on examining it he found that there was a great deal in it which must be looked into and altered. Accordingly he placed it in the hands of the solicitor to the Suitors' Fee Fund—not, of course, that he should pronounce an opinion upon the expediency of the Bill, because the Government took upon themselves the responsibility, but in order that he, being a gentleman of extreme accuracy, and thoroughly conversant with the subject, might examine the details. Such an examination necessarily occupied many weeks; but the result was that, as he believed, there was now no risk of any mistake in the provisions of the measure. As to the several

Acts of Parliament which it was proposed to repeal, they had been gone through with the same pains, and he believed that no apprehension need be felt on that score. As to the salaries of the officers being placed in the Votes, he must say that it did not appear to him that the Court of Chancery ought to claim an exemption, which was not enjoyed by other departments, from being subjected to the necessity of having the number of clerks inquired into by the Treasury, so that they might not be allowed to exceed the number requisite.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed to* a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 236.)

(*The Lord Dufferin.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Lord CAIRNS called attention to the 16th clause, of which he said he should probably feel it to be his duty to move the omission in Committee. The Act of 1863 gave power to the Commissioners of Fisheries in Ireland to order the destruction of stake nets where they deemed them to be illegal, but that power was to be exercised subject to an appeal to the Queen's Bench under a special case. As a matter of fact, a number of orders had been made by the Commissioners in accordance with the authority thus vested in them, and had, on appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, been reversed. The Commissioners, notwithstanding, refused to grant certificates as to the legality of the fishing in those instances, and the Act of 1863 contained no provision to meet that difficulty. That being so, the present Bill proposed to enact that no mode of fishing should be legal unless the certificate of the Commissioners was obtained—thus rendering valueless by a sort of side wind the decisions of the Queen's Bench, and to declare that to be legal which the court had declared to be illegal. That was a point on which he should like to have some explanation from the Government.

House in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 15, inclusive, *agreed to.*

The Lord Chancellor

Clause 16 (Penalty for fishing with fixed engine without certificate of commissioners or inspectors).

Lord DUFFERIN said, that, as far as he was instructed, the clause was not open to the criticism which the noble and learned Lord had put upon it; but he thought the point which had been raised had better be dealt with on the Report.

Lord CAIRNS said, that if a clause were introduced on the Report, which would entirely save the decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench, he would be satisfied.

Lord DUFFERIN acceded to the suggestion, and the Bill passed through Committee.

An Amendment made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

TRADES' UNIONS (PROTECTION OF FUNDS) BILL—(No. 226.)

(*The Earl of Morley.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee."

Lord CAIRNS said, there appeared to be a misapprehension as to the object of the Bill. He understood from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack the other night that this Bill had been brought in, because there had been certain decisions given by the courts of law under which, by reason of some technical illegality on the part of trades unions, the executive bodies of those trades unions were unable to proceed against and convict persons who had been guilty of embezzlement of their funds. He (Lord Cairns) had endeavoured to ascertain the particulars of those decisions, and he thought the noble and learned Lord had been misinformed. What he understood the courts to have decided was that where trades unions, by reason of the illegality in their rules, being in restraint of trade, were not able to register themselves as friendly societies, they could not have the benefit of that summary proceeding against their officers which friendly societies by law enjoyed. There was no difficulty in trades unions benefit societies proceeding against their officers for embezzlement, any more than other benefit societies, and it was only when their rules were in restraint of trade that they were prevented from doing so; and it had not been decided that trades unions were not entitled to the full benefit of the Act passed last Session, which enabled all societies of any kind to proceed against their officers for embezzlement of their funds. It was a very unusual kind of legislation to introduce a Bill which was to last only for one year in the face of the Report of the Commissioners on Trades Unions, whose recommendations went to this effect—that trades unions might be registered as friendly societies, provided they complied with certain conditions. It was a very unusual kind of legislation to authorize trades unions to register themselves for the purpose of recovering from their officers. There was no difficulty in trades unions recovering from their officers for embezzlement under the Act of last Session.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he did not think his noble and learned Friend would say that an illegal society could recover by virtue of the Act of last Session. It was held by the majority of the Judges that a trades union whose rules were in restraint of trade, and therefore illegal, could not be registered under the Friendly Societies Act. The Act of last Session could not improve that state of things in any way, and great anxiety was therefore felt in regard to this Bill, which had been brought in for a temporary purpose, while a general measure was under consideration.

Lord CAIRNS observed that the Act of last Session said that no person should be acquitted of a charge of embezzlement, on the ground that he was a partner along with those whose money had been taken. The illegality of those trades unions had nothing whatever to do with that. The Commissioners reported—

> "That the registration of trades unions might be effected through the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and it would be his duty to see that the rules and by-laws of a society claiming to be registered were unobjectionable—that is, not intended to promote those objects which we now proceed to specify as justifying, in our opinion, the refusal of registration—
>
> "1. To prevent the employment or to limit the number of apprentices.
>
> "2. To prevent the introduction, or to limit the use of machinery in any trade or manufacture.
>
> "3. To prevent any workman from taking a sub-contract or working by the piece, or working in common with men not members of the union.
>
> "4. To authorize interference, in the way of support from the funds of the union, by the council or governing body of the union, with the workmen of any other union when out on strike, or when otherwise engaged in any dispute with their employer, in any case in which such other union is an unconnected union."

In the face of that Report they were, by this Bill, going to allow to be registered as friendly societies those trades unions who might infringe every one of those four articles which he had just read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought his noble and learned Friend would not say that on an indictment being laid the property embezzled must not be described as the property of somebody; and it could not be set out as being the property of an illegal society.

The Earl of MORLEY said, the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) said the Bill flew in the face of the Report of the Commissioners. Now, at page 20 of their Report, paragraph 59, the Commissioners said—

> "It may be assumed, therefore, that the trades unions, with very few exceptions, have, by their rules and proceedings, placed their funds more or less beyond the protection of the law; and they are not altogether relieved either by the Act (31 & 32 *Vict.*, c. 116) giving remedies to associations in cases of larceny by members thereof, or by the section in the Friendly Societies Act applicable to trade societies (18 & 19 *Vict.* c. 63, sec. 44) since that section applies only to societies established for 'any purpose which is not illegal.' This is a state of things which we think ought not to be allowed to continue; and we are brought therefore to the consideration of that part of your Majesty's Commission which directs us to suggest any improvements to be made in the law with respect to trades unions."

Therefore the majority of the Commissioners were distinctly of opinion that the state of things by which the funds of trades unions are very imperfectly protected by law should not be allowed to continue. It seemed to him that the Act of last year did not meet the case of the trades unions thoroughly. That Act had two objects. First, it repealed the doctrine of common law by which co-partners were not liable to be sued in case of the embezzlement of the property of the partnership. In the next place it extended to the crime of embezzlement the provisions of the Act 18 & 19 *Vict.* c. 126, which authorized summary prosecutions in cases of larceny and other offences. But those offences could be brought before justices of the peace in a summary way only if the defendants consented, and if the defendants objected the proceeding must be by indictment; and that being so trades unions were placed at a disadvantage. The object of the present Bill was to enable trades unions to have the same advantages as friendly societies in regard to proceeding in a summary way in cases of embezzlement or misappropriation of their funds by any of their officers. But another important point not touched by the Bill of last year was that trades unions could not recover their property in the shape of books, papers, or other documents. The present Bill would provide a remedy for that evil. He desired also to point out to their Lordships that by this Bill no sort of civil status was given to trades unions. It gave no advantages to any association for criminal purposes, nor, indeed, to any society whatever for illegal purposes, except it be in restraint of trade; but he ventured to submit that "restraint of trade" was a somewhat ambiguous term, and that there was great difference of opinion in the country as to what was "restraint of trade" and what was not. He ventured to submit that the law on this subject was at present anything but clear and precise. He trusted, therefore, their Lordships would assent to this Bill, seing that it had passed the House of Commons without any opposition whatever, and almost without discussion. If their Lordships were to pass this Bill they would be conferring great advantages on trades unions, without in any way touching those controverted questions to which the Commission had referred.

Lord CAIRNS said, the noble Lord had read a passage from the Report which pointed out certain difficulties in the way of trades unions recovering as against their officers; but the Report went on further to say that it would be the duty of the Registrar of Friendly Societies "to see that the rules and bylaws of a society claiming to be registered were unobjectionable" — that is, not intended to promote certain specified objects. By allowing, therefore, trades unions to be registered as friendly societies they would be able to recover as against their officers, provided they did not infringe any of the four cardinal points which, in the opinion of the Commissioners, would make such societies absolutely and radically illegal.

The Earl of LICHFIELD said, he desired to call attention to some remarks of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) on the second reading, because they had led to some misapprehension as to the views of the Commissioners, and he believed also as to the objects of the Government in introducing the Bill—though he had no communication with them on the subject. The remarks to which he referred were that the provisions of this Bill were not framed in accordance with the views of the Commissioners, and that the Bill had been introduced by the Government with the object of recognizing in some way those trades unions as friendly societies. These were two very important points, and he wished to call attention to an opinion which he held very strongly, that the provisions of this Bill were not at variance with the Report of the Commissioners. But first he would ask their Lordships' attention to the position of these societies, and why it was that they asked for the protection it was proposed to give them by this Bill. To obtain a correct notion of that position it was necessary to refer to certain decisions in our courts of law. In the year 1867, the case of "Hornby *v.* Close" was decided in the Court of Queen's Bench, and that decision was that the society, which was then prosecuting an officer for embezzling its funds, had no grounds for proceeding in consequence of its being an illegal society, through one of its rules prohibiting piece-work. The next case, that of "Farrar *v.* Close," was in 1868. In that case the Court of Queen's Bench decided that, although there was a rule providing for the support of members out of employment, that rule did not operate necessarily in restraint of trade; and, therefore, as the case was brought before the court, the society would have had ground for proceeding against its officer. But the case having been referred from the justices at Bradford, the Court of Queen's Bench intimated that possibly evidence might be adduced to show that this rule did operate in restraint of trade. The case was then remitted to the magistrates, and evidence was taken, from which it appeared that this rule had been made to operate in restraint of trade, by encouraging and promoting strikes. The case then came back before the Court of Queen's Bench, and the judgment of the magistrates was confirmed. Now, when this case came back before the Court of Queen's Bench it was clearly decided that a society subscribing funds for the support of strikes, and thus having a rule operating in restraint of trade, was thereby an illegal society. Now, upon this subject he must call attention to the views and recommendations of the Commissioners as contained in their Report. And here he must remind their Lordships that he was not one of those who signed the Report—that is to say, the Report of the majority. He wished to observe, however, that in the Report of the majority of the Commissioners were to be found views which, in his opinion, were in accordance with the provisions of this Bill. He would first call the attention of the noble and learned Lord to page 20, paragraph 60, in which it was said—

> "With regard to the general question of the right of workmen to combine together for determining and stipulating with their employer the terms on which only they will consent to work for him, we think that, provided the combination be perfectly voluntary, and that full liberty be left to all other workmen to undertake the work which the parties combining have refused, and that no obstruction be placed in the way of the employer resorting elsewhere in search of a supply of labour, there is no ground of justice or of policy for withholding such a right from the workmen. It cannot be doubted that a demand, backed by the resolution of a large body of workmen to decline work if the demand be not acceded to, comes with more force than that of an isolated workman; and we think that the workmen may reasonably claim to be allowed any advantage which they can derive from such concerted action in bargaining with their employer from time to time as to the terms on which they will dispose of their labour."

These were the views of the Commissioners as to the right to combine. Then, if their Lordships turned to page 22, paragraph 73, they would find what the Commissioners' recommendations were—

> "With regard to the general question of the right of combination, we are prepared to recommend, in accordance with the principles above stated, that a Bill be brought in, so far relaxing the existing law as in substance to enact that no combination of persons for the purpose of determining among themselves, or of stipulating for, the terms on which they will consent to employ or be employed, shall be unlawful by reason only that its operation would be in restraint of trade."

Now, that was a direct recommendation by the Commissioners of some such Bill as was now before their Lordships. If their Lordships turned to page 24, paragraph 78, they would find that the Commissioners said—

> "With regard to existing trades unions, we think that, subject to certain conditions, to be presently stated, they should be relieved from their present anomalous position."

And in paragraph 79 they said—

> "We notice also that societies have now facilities to apply the law against larceny and embezzlement to offences by their officers and other members coming within the recent 'Act to amend the Law relating to Larceny and Embezzlement, 31 and 32 Victoria, c. 116.' But, although some progress has thus been made towards security for the rights of members of unions, there would be advantage to the unions if they were established with the capacities, rights, and liabilities arising from a status recognized by law; and there would be advantage to the public if their proceedings were made public, and the officers of unions acting according to law had the position to which persons discharging important duties are entitled."

He entirely agreed with the last half of that paragraph, and it was because he held that view that he dissented from the conditions laid down by the Commissioners, as conditions without compliance with which no society ought to obtain the protection of the law for its funds. There were only four conditions laid down by the Commissioners, and that principle upon which the last decision of the courts was based—namely, that a society was illegal which subscribed funds in support of strikes—was not one of them. Of the four objects deemed objectionable by the Commissioners, and as justifying in their opinion the refusal of registration, the fourth and most important—relating to the support by unions, in cases of strike, of men belonging to other and unconnected unions—was not thought objectionable by two of the Commissioners, who entered a dissent upon this point at the end of the Report. The provisions of the Bill, therefore, were not at variance with the opinions or recommendations of the Commissioners. He (the Earl of Lichfield) appreciated the difficulties of the Government in their endeavours to define what should make a society illegal, and pronounced the four conditions quoted by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) inconsistent with paragraph 73 of the Report, in which the Commissioners say that societies should not be held illegal on account only of any rule operating in restraint of trade. He felt it would be also inconsistent to declare illegal societies having rules to limit apprenticeship or to prohibit piecework, when other societies recognized as legal had rules quite as unsound upon economical grounds. The noble and learned Lord had hinted the other night that this Bill was designed to recognize trades union societies by a side wind, and in that way to give them all the advantages of the Friendly Societies Act. If that were so, he would be the first to oppose it—and, moreover, the Bill would have been opposed by the trades unions themselves. The Bill simply gave trades unions the advantages conferred on friendly societies by the 44th clause of the Friendly Societies Act — that summary mode of procedure in cases of fraud so necessary to such associations. Having given much consideration to the matter, he was extremely grateful to the Government for having introduced a measure calculated to do away with what he felt to be a great injustice; for trades unions were, after all, simply associations of persons combined together for the purpose of promoting their own interests—the uniform object of most associations. Why, therefore, should these trade societies be deprived of the legal protection to their property which every other person in the country possessed? He confessed he could not understand upon what ground of expediency or policy their Lordships could refuse such an equitable demand, so long as those societies conducted their affairs in a manner unstained by anything criminal. If their Lordships believed those societies to be criminal or manifestly illegal, they ought not to rest satisfied with punishing them by simply withholding from them that legal protection which all other societies possessed; but they ought to go much further, and boldly declare that such societies should be altogether prohibited. He trusted their Lordships would assent to the Bill.

Lord PENZANCE thought the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) took an extravagant view of the case. The Bill simply proposed to confer upon trades unions for one year—during which a more efficient measure might be matured—the same legal means of protecting their funds from fraud and embezzlement as was enjoyed by friendly societies. The noble and learned Lord opposite said they had the power to protect their funds from fraud already under the statute of last year. Without inquiring whether this was so or not, he (Lord Penzance) wished simply to point out that the only object of this Bill was to give them a more efficient and ready means of access to that power—such means as the law already gave to friendly societies. It might be a question whether it should be pronounced unwise and unjust to say trades unions should not recover in cases of fraud; but surely it would be still more unwise if, having that power, the Legislature should refuse to give them a ready means of availing themselves of the remedies the law gave them. Looking at the limited time the law would operate, and the limited nature of its provisions, he could not conceive what objection could be raised to, it even from the standpoint of his noble and learned Friend opposite.

Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee accordingly.

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

SEEDS ADULTERATION BILL.

(*The Earl of Devon.*)

(NO. 242.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Earl of DEVON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that its purpose was to repress by more effectual enactments than those at present in force the practice of adulterating seeds in fraud of the purchasers and to the great detriment of agriculture. As to the prevalence and extent of the practice he would only refer their Lordships to the evidence taken before the Select Committee to which the Bill had been referred by the House of Commons. The practices against which it was directed, and which prevailed extensively, were the sale of seed which had been "killed" by the action of fire, or by other artificial means by which it was deprived of the power of germination, and the sale of spurious seed which had been fraudulently coloured in imitation of genuine seed. Adulteration was carried on principally in turnip seed and clover seed, and in the interests of agriculture, and as affecting the food supplies of the country, it was important that it should be stopped. The penalty imposed for the commission of either of these kinds of fraud was for the first offence a penalty not exceeding £5; and for the second and any subsequent a penalty not exceeding £50; and in the latter cases the court were authorized in addition to cause the offender's name, business, place of abode, and the particulars of his offence to be published in any newspaper or in any other manner, at the offender's own expense.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he rather doubted the expediency of multiplying offences for the purpose of preventing practices such as those described. It might be that seeds were adulterated, and that farmers suffered in consequence; but he believed that in most cases they might by reasonable precaution protect themselves. He would not offer any opposition to the Bill, for though he did not think it likely to be of any particular use, he thought it would be harmless. In Committee he would propose certain Amendments, which he had submitted to his noble Friend opposite, and the object of which was to simplify the provisions of the Bill. He would take care that the Amendments were placed in the hands of their Lordships before the Bill went into Committee.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

DUBLIN FREEMEN COMMISSION BILL.

(*The Lord Lurgan.*)

(NO. 210.) SECOND READING.

On Order of the Day for the Second Reading,

LORD REDESDALE said, he felt it his duty to move that the Order be discharged. Their Lordships were aware of the care he had always taken to prevent the Business of the House at the close of the Session being conducted in a manner injurious to the character of the House. He thought it of the greatest possible importance that the House should never be taken by surprise by any measure, and particularly by one of great importance. This Bill came to their Lordships some time ago without any notice of its being a Government measure; and now, when many of their Lordships had left the House for the Session, notice was given—not by a Member of the Government—of an intention to proceed with it. Whether the step was taken with the concurrence of the Government he did not know; but, whether it was or not, he must say that this was a Bill which ought not to be proceeded with at this period of the Session. It was of considerable importance in point of principle, and it was entirely without precedent. There had never before been an inquiry with respect to one class of voters in a borough. He would put it to their Lordships to consider how unfair such a proceeding would be in itself. Suppose a Judge had reported that bribery had prevailed in a particular ward of a borough, would that justify an inquiry with regard to that ward alone, with a view to its disfranchisement? Their Lordships might feel that this was a Bill affecting the other House, and that it therefore called for some concession from this; but on that very ground he contended that the Bill required particular attention. They all knew that where party feeling ran high, things might be done for a party object, although they were ostensibly done in the name of justice. For this reason their Lordships ought to be jealous of any action of an unusual character in a matter of this kind. Their Lordships could not help knowing that a large body of voters in Dublin were supposed to entertain views which were not in favour with a majority of the present House of Commons; therefore, their Lordships ought to be particularly careful what they did in a matter of this kind, and ought to see that equal justice was done as between the two parties. If there had been any precedent for this Bill, and if it had come before their Lordships under ordinary circumstances, it would have been open to fair discussion; but, considering what had taken place upon the subject, as well as the history of the Bill, and the time of the Session at which it had come up to their Lordships, it was a serious quostion whether the Bill should be allowed to proceed further. The question of the Dublin election was discussed in that House on the 8th of June, when their Lordships were asked to concur in an Address to the Crown sent up by the Commons, praying for the appointment of a Commission to make inquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at the last Dublin election. In the course of discussion it was shown that the Report of the Judge did not authorize such a proceeding, and their Lordships did not concur in the Address. In the other House of Parliament, on the 17th of June, a Bill was introduced for disfranchising the freemen of Dublin; but that was thought rather a strong proceeding, and therefore, on the 1st of July, leave was given to introduce this Bill for a Commission. It came up to their Lordships' House on the 22nd of July; and from that date to the 30th no notice was taken of it, although the Bill had been introduced into the other House by the Attorney General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Under such circumstances most of their Lordships must have believed that the Bill was dropped, and that it was not intended to proceed with it. It was extremely objectionable that a Government measure should pass without notice for so many days at the close of the Session, if it was intended to proceed with it, and such a proceeding was calculated to bring discredit on their Lordships' House. For these reasons he moved that the Order for the second reading be discharged.

Moved, "That the Order of the Day for the Second Reading be discharged."—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

EARL GRANVILLE said, as to this Bill reaching their Lordships at a late period of the Session, the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees had shown that it did not leave the House of Commons until a very late period; and, as to many noble Lords having left town, there had been above an average attendance that evening; therefore he could not attach the slightest importance to the reasons alleged for rejecting the Bill before the second reading was moved, and he must urge their Lordships to consider the Bill on its merits. He entirely repudiated the idea that the Government was actuated by party motives; and he could not conceive how that stigma could have been applied to the Government if the noble Lord himself had been entirely free from such motives—particularly as the Government had left the Bill to be taken up in that House by a Peer who did not belong to the Administration.

LORD CAIRNS said, he would not go into the merits of the Bill, which everyone must admit was one of very great gravity. It proposed *ex post facto* legislation and legislation without precedent. The Bill came up to this House on the 22nd of July; it was now the 2nd of August; during that interval it might have been carried through all its stages if their Lordships had approved it; and now a number of noble Lords, and especially those connected with Ireland, had left London having fairly concluded that the Bill would not be proceeded with. It was not right that such a measure should be brought under their consideration after the Appropriation Bill had been introduced into the other House.

On Question ? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 32; Not-Contents 33: Majority 1.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Order of the Day read accordingly.

LORD LURGAN, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time said, that it had been carefully considered and fully debated in "another place," and on two occasions had been carried by large majorities. He was aware that the Bill was objected to as a piece of exceptional legislation, and that it was said that the usual course was to act on an Address from both Houses of Parliament. But that course had been adopted in the other House, and their Lordships had declined to join in the Address, owing to some alleged informality in the Judge's Report. The matter had for the time dropped; but that could not be accepted as a final settlement of the question, and the present Bill was introduced, being simply a Bill for the appointment of Commissioners to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices among the freemen electors of the City of Dublin. It was based on the Report of the learned Judge who tried the petition, before whom an immense number of witnesses were examined, and who reported that he had reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed among the freemen. This was certainly a grave charge against them; and, supposing it for a moment to be true, he did not see how another election could be held until after full inquiry—for surely it would be worse than ridiculous to give these freemen, who had thus unworthily exercised the franchise, an opportunity of again disgracing, not only themselves, but also, indirectly, the whole constituency of the metropolis of Ireland. The freemen were undoubtedly a large portion of the constituency of Dublin, numbering between a fourth and a fifth of the whole body. Under present circumstances he would offer no opinion respecting them; but any noble Lord who wished to learn more of their proceedings at contested elections could read the report of the proceedings at the late trial of the election petition. If all there stated were true, it was quite clear that a case was made out for inquiry and exposure. If, on the other hand, there had been any misapprehension or misrepresentation, it was incumbent on those who agreed with him, and doubly incumbent on noble Lords opposite, who had always found these freemen firm allies, to give them the opportunity, which this Bill afforded, of vindicating their character by an inquiry before Commissioners in whom the utmost reliance might be placed. On these grounds he ventured to ask their Lordships to assent to the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Lurgan.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, the Bill involved a principle which ought not to be sanctioned by the House, and he would therefore move an Amendment that it be read a second time this day three months. Last year an Act had been passed after considerable discussion, putting an end to the trial of election petitions by Committees of the other House. Now, it was because the Report of the learned Judge who tried the Dublin election petition did not conform to the condition of the Act, which would alone justify the issue of a Commission, that their Lordships had refused to concur in the Address which had been sent up from the other House on the subject in the early part of the Session. That Justice Keogh was a man who was likely to commit an informality, no one who knew the distinguished reputation of that learned Judge was likely to believe; and if he had been of opinion that extensive bribery prevailed at the late election for Dublin he was not the person to shrink from giving expression to that opinion in his Report. No objection, he might add, had been made by the Members of the Conservative party in the other House to the issue of Commissions in those cases in which the Judge had reported that extensive bribery prevailed, and to endeavour to make such cases the subject of party contests, and to enter upon the course of legislation proposed by the Government would, he contended, be to run the risk of returning to a state of things in every way discreditable to Parliamentary Government, when almost every contested election was made the subject of a Parliamentary battle. Without wishing to say anything offensive to noble Lords opposite, he must be allowed to point out that in the division which had just been taken the majority against the Motion of his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees for the discharge of the Bill was only 1, and that if such questions were to be decided in that sort of way the public out-of-doors could scarcely be expected to regard the decision of the House with any great respect—seeing especially that those who voted in the majority were, for the most part, composed of Members of the Government whose official duties compelled them to stay in town. As to the freemen against whom the Bill was directed, they amounted, he believed, in all to 2,700; and was it right, he would ask, because charges were brought against some 250 of that number, to pass against the whole of them a measure which could not be regarded otherwise than as a measure of pains and penalties? Those 2,700 electors comprised a most respectable class of men, and he for one protested against having the innocent confounded with the guilty in the way proposed, and a stigma cast upon them which they by no means deserved. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that the Act of last Session provided a remedy in cases of corruption. The Attorney General might have prosecuted in those cases; and if he had done so, and it had been proved the law was not sufficient to meet them, then the Act of last Session might have been supplemented by further legislation. Nothing, however, so far as he was aware, had been done by the Government to vindicate the majesty of the law by prosecuting those whose names had been laid before them as guilty of bribery; and he for one objected to the *ex post facto* legislation which they now invited the House to sanction—legislation, too, which would violate the fundamental principle that a Member of the House of Commons represented the whole of his constituency and not a fractional part of it, whether represented by freemen or lodgers or any other class of voters. For those reasons he should move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months.")—(*The Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, that if he might venture to express an opinion with respect to the credit of the House to which the noble Earl (Earl Beauchamp) had alluded, he did not think it would be consulted by a refusal to pass the present Bill, and thus far placing their Lordships in the position of protectors of corrupt voters. What was the exact point involved in the measure? The noble Earl seemed in his speech completely to overlook the fact that Mr. Justice Keogh, who tried the election petition, had reported that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed among the freemen of Dublin at the last election—a fact which, by no less an authority than the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, had been deemed sufficient ground for praying the Crown to issue a Commission of Inquiry. Their Lordships refused to concur with the other House in the Address praying for the issue of such a Commission, because it was pointed out that there might be some doubt—which he supposed was what his noble Friend behind meant when he spoke of an informality—as to whether such a Report as Mr. Justice Keogh had made entitled the House to vote an Address to the Crown. That was a technical difficulty; but looking to the spirit of the Act of last Session he felt sure that the noble Lord opposite would feel that it would be absurd that Parliament should be precluded from dealing with the case of a corrupt class of voters, merely because they happened to be supporters of the one political party or the other in the State. Mr. Justice Keogh, at the end of his judgment, said that it was proved by what appeared to him most conclusive evidence, direct and circumstantial, that the freemen of the City of Dublin had been shown to a great extent to be corrupt voters, and that he would leave the House of Commons to deal with their case and with the constituency as affected by it. What could be more clear than that Mr. Justice Keogh contemplated Parliamentary action in that case? The clear intention of the Act and of Mr. Justice Keogh's judgment was that that corruption should not pass without notice. He therefore trusted that their Lordships would not follow the advice given them to reject that Bill.

Lord CAIRNS maintained, in opposition to the noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley) that there was no question of technicality or informality raised in the discussion that took place on the proposed Address in their Lordships' House. The objection raised was that the Act of Parliament had not been complied with, and that therefore there was no power to address the Crown; and on that ground their Lordships refused to concur in the Address. The Bill was very objectionable on the ground that it proposed *ex post facto* legislation, and that upon a subject to which of all others that kind of legislation ought not to be applied. He looked upon the Act of last year as an extremely valuable one, and as effecting one of the greatest improvements ever made in election law; and it was by that Act that proceedings relating to elections ought to be governed; and he maintained that the resort to special Acts of Parliament to deal with cases was the most dangerous of all undertakings in which Parliament could engage. If they legislated to-day specially with the Dublin election after it had taken place, they must legislate to-morrow specially with some other election after it had been held. And if they pursued that course—although he did not suggest that any person was actuated by party motives in that or any other case—the consequence would in the long run be that they would get into that line of action which Parliament years ago avowed its desire to abandon—namely, that of dealing with particular cases in a way which excited the party feeling and prejudice of those who engaged in such legislation. It was from that dilemma they were extricated by the Act of last year, and it was in that direction that the present Bill proposed to make a relapse. On that ground he objected to the measure.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was extremely surprised at the opposition now offered to the Bill. When, on a former occasion, their Lordships were requested to join in an Address which the House of Commons was prepared to adopt under the Act of last Session, it was said to be dangerous to take that course, because, should it turn out that the Report of the learned Judge did not justify such an Address, in what a position would the learned Judge and the Commissioners be placed if they attempted to commit anybody by virtue of that Act, and if it were found that by committing any person they exceeded the powers given in the Act? He had not been prepared to face the possibility of there being such a difficulty on the part of those who conducted the inquiry—so that they would have had to act under very considerable disadvantage. And what did his noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns) say then? Why, that that was not the right course to take—that they had other remedies; that they might have a Committee of the House of Commons, or they might bring in a Bill. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer, in "another place," took exactly the same line and recommended a Bill. Again, it was said that this was *ex post facto* legislation; but a Committee of the House of Commons had examined into the corruption of the freemen of Yarmouth, and a Bill was afterwards brought in disfranchising them. Mr. Justice Keogh had found extensive bribery to exist among a large class of the constituency, consisting of 2,700 persons: about 270 cases of gross corruption had been proved against the Dublin freemen; The House of Commons, being anxious to preserve the purity of its elections, but at the same time wishing to avoid party bias, concurred in resigning its power to deal with these matters by its own Committees, and passed an Act by which such questions should be investigated by the Judges. Well, that new method of investigation had been adopted; and when about one-tenth part of a large class of voters had been found by a learned Judge guilty of flagrant corruption, their Lordships would place themselves in a strange position if, in opposition to the desire of the other House to purge itself of that gross corruption, they would not allow any further step to be taken for its punishment.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships divided:—Contents 29; Not-Contents 27: Majority 2.

Resolved in the *Affirmative;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

EDUCATION BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to enable Town Councils to promote Education in England and Wales—Was *presented* by The Lord STRATHEDEN; read 1ª. (No. 259.)

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 2nd August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Despatch of Business in Parliament [No. 386].

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan (Guarantee)*.

Ordered — First Reading — Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan (Guarantee)* [253]; Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation* [254]; Contagious Diseases* [255]; Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c.* [256].

Second Reading — Bishops Resignation [241]; Harbour of Galle Loan* [250]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [244]; East India Loan* [251]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* [248].

Committee — Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [215]—R.P.

Committee—Report—Dividends on Public Stocks* [247].

Considered as amended—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [238]; Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* [227].

Third Reading — Expiring Laws Continuance* [245]; Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham)* [210], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Heritable Rights (*re-comm.*)* [234].

HERTS CONSTABULARY.

QUESTION.

MR. C. REED said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Inspector Young, of the Herts Constabulary, was recently removed from his office upon a well-founded charge of exceeding his duty under circumstances of peculiar aggravation; whether, notwithstanding his dismissal, he has been permitted to discharge his accustomed duties; and, whether, it is true that he has been re-instated in the office of Inspector in the town of Hitchin, where the offence was committed?

MR. BRUCE, in reply, said, he believed the facts, as stated by his hon. Friend were substantially correct. This inspector had performed an act exceeding his authority under the circumstances mentioned. He was suspended by the local bench of magistrates and re-instated by those of the county, he (Mr. Bruce) presumed on a consideration of the facts as known to them. He must remind his hon. Friend that, as Home Secretary, he had no power whatever over appointments or removals of members of the county constabulary.

ARMY—SOLDIERS' EMPLOYMENT.

QUESTION.

Dr. BREWER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If the Government have satisfactory accounts of the results of the industrial employment of Soldiers in their leisure time at the various Military Depôts where the system has been allowed; and if so, whether he will extend the advantage of this system to the Soldiers in Camp at Colchester?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that very satisfactory accounts had been received of the system of soldiers' employment to which the hon. Member referred. He was very anxious to extend the system as far as possible. He knew no reason why it should not be applied to Colchester, and he hoped it would soon be applied.

EGYPT—SUEZ CANAL.

QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has received any official information as to the probable navigable depth of water expected in and through the Suez Canal; and when it is to be opened for general commercial purposes?

Mr. OTWAY, in reply, said, he would give his hon. Friend all the information on the matter of which he was possessed, only premising that it was not official. Mr. Fowler, the engineer, who was in Egypt at the beginning of the present year, in an account of the canal, published in *The Times* on the 1st of February, describes its depth as 26 ft. He says—

> "With minute exceptions the whole of the canal is now being excavated, and completed according to one or other of the following sections:—The first section is 22 miles in length (the difficult part of the work), 196 ft. in width at the surface of the water, and 26 ft. deep for 72 ft. at bottom. The second section is 77 miles in length, 327 ft. in width at surface, and a similar depth of 26ft., for a similar width of 72 ft. at the bottom."

They had heard from other sources, however, that the depth did not exceed 18 ft. It had also been stated that the opening of the canal had been fixed by the company for the 17th of November next, though there was reason to doubt whether the works would be sufficiently advanced by that date to warrant the canal being then opened for general navigation.

IRELAND—GLEBES AND GLEBE HOUSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. STACPOOLE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill early next Session to give facilities for the purchase of Glebes and the erection of Glebe Houses for the Ministers of all Religious Denominations in Ireland, and to enable Loans to be advanced for that purpose by the Board of Works or other public body in Ireland?

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: Yes, Sir, the Government do hope to bring in such a Bill next Session.

RAILWAY GUARDS AND PASSENGERS COMMUNICATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, How soon the various Railway Companies will comply with the provisions of the Act 31 & 32 Vict. c. 119, s. 22, requiring them to provide means of communication between the passengers and the servants of the company; and whether he could inform the House what the nature of such communication will be?

Mr. BRIGHT: Sir, I believe I am able to state that from yesterday, that is, from the 1st of this month, on all lines to which the Act applies there will be some mode of communication between the passengers and the drivers and the guards. There are three forms of communication by way of rope, and one, I think, which is managed upon the electric principle, which have been sanctioned. Of course, the Board of Trade is not able to say positively whether these plans will be perfect and absolutely satisfactory; but they meet so entirely the view of those most competent to judge in regard to these matters, that the Board of Trade has sanctioned them, and hope they will do all that the Act of Parliament had in view.

MR. J. G. TALBOT: Is the communication really in existence?

MR. BRIGHT: The day fixed was the 1st of August. I travelled by a train about a week ago, and there was no mode of communication. But I believe the communication is found to-day on all the lines to which the Act refers.

ARMY—SPITHEAD FORTS.—QUESTION.

CAPTAIN BEAUMONT said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War that, inasmuch as a considerable section of the House is opposed to the outlay contingent on the Spithead Forts being constructed to mount two tiers of guns in place of one, Whether he will be willing to re-consider the propriety of reducing the scale on which the Forts on the Horse Sand and No Man's Land Sand are proposed to be constructed, and so effect a saving of £225,000?

MR. CARDWELL, in reply, said he hoped the House would remember that in preparing the Bill which had received its approval the whole amount had been reduced below the amount included in the Act of 1867. It was reduced by £491,000 below the estimate of Sir Frederick Grey, and if £75,000 allowed by the Act for unforeseen contingencies were included, the total reduction of the amount was £566,000; and the sum now voted was below the Schedule of 1867 by £85,000. This reduction had been accomplished by giving up works not yet commenced, and postponing other works which might be considered at a future time. The smaller forts had been reduced to one tier, and with regard to the larger forts, it had been considered more truly economical to construct them of two tiers as originally designed. He hoped the hon. and gallant Member would be satisfied with his assurance that the works would be conducted with a strict regard to economy.

PATENT LAWS.—QUESTION.

MR. MACFIE said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, among the measures contemplated next Session is one for the Reform of the Patent Laws; and, if so, whether it is to be preceded by an Inquiry by a Committee or a Royal Commission?

MR. BRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of the Government agrees with my hon. Friend that some considerable change at any rate is necessary to be made in the Patent Laws. I am not sure how many, or whether any, are of opinion that there ought not to be any Patent Laws at all. But notwithstanding their agreement as to the desirableness of some alteration, it would be very imprudent, I think, for me to pledge the Government to bring in a measure of this nature when there is so great a difference of opinion upon it, and when it seems impossible for any two men to agree as to the change that should be made. At the same time, if we come to a question of a Committee or of a Royal Commission, we are in the same difficulty, as we are at a loss to know whether the inquiry should be made as to what amendment should take place in the law, or whether there should be any patent system at all. I can only conclude by saying that, admitting with the hon. Member for Leith that the question is one which requires to be attended to whenever there is time to attend to it, I am quite unable to say that the Government will bring in a Bill next Session. If my hon. Friend were to propose a Committee of this House it would be a very reasonable proposition, to which the Members of the Government and this House would probably agree.

MR. MACFIE said, he would give notice that, if the Government did not bring in a Bill, he would bring the subject before the House early next Session, with the view to the appointment of a Committee or a Royal Commission.

INDIA—PRINCE AZEEM JAH.
QUESTION.

COLONEL SYKES said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Secretary of State for India had not determined to set aside the sum of £150,000 so far back as April, 1867, and, subsequently, a further sum of £120,000, for the purpose of liquidating certain claims on his Highness Prince Azeem Jah Bahadoor, Nawaub of the Carnatic, and whether all or any part of such liabilities have been so liquidated; and, if not, when such liquidation is likely to be made?

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, in reply, that the Secretary of State in Council had granted a sum of £150,000 for the payment of Azeem Jah's debts; and at a subsequent period he lent Azeem Jah the sum of £120,000 for the same purpose, to be recovered from him by instalments. The last telegram which the Government had received on the subject, dated July 13th last, informed them that the liquidation was progressing satisfactorily, and approaching its close.

INDIA—CALCUTTA PORT DUES.

QUESTION.

Mr. ARMITSTEAD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true that a Bill has been brought into the Bengal Council, proposing to raise the Port Dues at Calcutta, already so excessive, from four annas per ton to eight annas; and, whether this serious advance of charge has been approved by the Home Government?

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, in reply, that a Bill had been brought into the Bengal Legislative Council for raising the port dues of Calcutta, but the Government had received no official information about it. In consequence, however, of the receipt of certain memorials, they had already communicated with the Government of India on the subject.

INDIA—RAILWAYS.—QUESTION.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to ask his hon. Friend opposite a Question, of which he had privately given him notice, Whether there will be any objection to lay on the Table any Official Correspondence with reference to the system of construction of Railways in India, not included in the Papers presented last week; and, whether any dissents have been recorded by Members of the Council to the Despatch of the Duke of Argyll of the 15th of July?

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, in reply, that there would be no objection to lay the correspondence upon the table. As at present advised, he believed that no such dissents had been recorded. He proposed, however, to answer the Question to-morrow.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Having reference to the present state of Public Business, I beg to move that Government Orders of the Day have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday, August 3 and 4.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he apprehended that the Motion just made by his right hon. Friend would be a sore blow and heavy discouragement to the Bill which the learned Common Serjeant had been pushing with so much pertinacity during the Session—he meant the Bill for the abolition of sisters-in-law. He, therefore, begged to ask the hon. and learned Member whether, under present circumstances, he still desired to prosecute the Bill; or whether he would not give a holiday to those who were bound to come down, whether to support or to oppose the measure, by moving that the Order be discharged?

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he was unable to join in the vivacious tone adopted by the hon. Member. On the contrary, he should be inclined to adopt a very different tone, remembering the enormous number of persons whose dearest interests were involved in the question which he had the honour of raising. He quite agreed that the Government, in the actual state of Public Business, could not have taken any other course than that which had just been adopted by his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister, and he also agreed that it was impossible to prosecute the Bill with any hope of success during the brief remainder of the Session. In the name, however, of the thousands interested in the provisions of the Bill, he begged to thank those hon. Members who had supported it in the face of opposition carried beyond its usual limits, in the use made of the forms of the House. The history of the present Session afforded every encouragement to the belief that in another year the Bill would be passed successfully. There were, first, the large majorities by which the Bill had been supported; then, the most able speech in its favour of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, and, still more, the support given to it by the Prime Minister himself; finally, there was the progress of public sentiment in its favour which had shown itself, and nowhere more remarkably than in Scotland. Regretting that, through the action of particular Members, the Bill had been defeated this Session. he should take the earliest possible opportunity of re-introducing the measure next Session.

Motion *agreed to.*

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *considered.*

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he wished to express his great satisfaction with the manner in which the Bill had been dealt with by the other House of Parliament. They had not interfered with its leading principles or main provisions. The Amendments which had been made were chiefly verbal, and he was free to admit that the greater part of those Amendments were improvements. There were some to which that expression did not, in his opinion, altogether apply; but remembering that they had been introduced by noble Lords of great ability, eminence, and experience, he did not feel inclined to set up his own view in opposition to their Lordships; and hon. Members, as a rule, would, doubtless, share that feeling. There were three Amendments, however, which he thought it would be advisable to invite their Lordships to re-consider. The first was on the 5th clause, and related to the definition of a partnership, association, or company. As the clause left this House, the definition was "a partnership, association, or company corporate, or registered under the Companies' Act of 1862." Their Lordships had substituted the words "or liable to be wound up;" which made a very serious difference. A partnership of seven members was liable to be wound up; and if they adopted this Amendment, men, by simply taking several clerks into partnership with them, so as to make up the required number, would be able to carry on business as fraudulently as they pleased, and still not be subjected to the bankruptcy law. He could not help thinking that this point had not been sufficiently considered, and he should therefore ask the House to disagree on this matter to the Lords' Amendment. The next was in sub-section 3 of Clause 6, line 20. The clause originally stood thus—

> "That the debtor has, with intent to defeat or delay his creditors, done any of the following things—namely, departed out of England, or being out of England, remained out of England, or departed from his dwelling-house or otherwise absented himself; or begun to keep his house; or suffered himself to be outlawed."

The Lords had inserted the words "being a trader;" from which it would follow that such acts might be done by persons who were non-traders. That was a change in the law, as established in 1861, when it was expressly declared to be an act of bankruptcy for non-traders to depart the realm with intent to defeat or delay their creditors, and it seemed to him that the change was not for the better. He should, therefore, move to disagree to these words in line 20. He was prepared, however, to meet their Lordships half-way by inserting those words after the word "or," in line 23, the effect of which would be that the mere leaving the house by a non-trader would not constitute an act of bankruptcy. That was a fair compromise. He trusted that their Lordships would see the force of the arguments that had occurred to him, and that they would not insist upon the Amendments to which he objected. He proposed to add words to Clause 8 to limit the power of the County Courts trying causes under the Act to the extent of their present jurisdiction. There were one or two other technical matters with which he did not propose to trouble the House, in making that statement, and he now proposed to proceed with the consideration of the Lords' Amendments.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 2, line 20, after the word "debtor" to omit the words "being a trader," and insert those words in line 23 after the word "or."—(*The Attorney General.*)

MR. MORLEY said, it would be better to restore the words of the clause as it stood when the Bill left that House. He could see no reason for the distinction between the trader and the non-trader.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL explained that by agreeing to the compromise he had suggested they would maintain the existing law; and the words of the clause had acquired a technical signification in the case of traders. He should have preferred to have seen the clause pass as it went to the Upper

House; but what he proposed would make very little practical difference, and it would facilitate the passing of the Bill.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Meeting of creditors for appointment of persons to administer bankrupt's property).

Mr. MORLEY said, the point of the arrangement made in the Bill was, that having appointed a trustee the creditors should appoint a committee, consisting of fit persons, not exceeding five in number. The Lords had struck out the word "shall" in reference to the appointment of the committee, and inserted the word "may" in its place. It was important that the appointment of a committee should be imperative, and he thought the Lords' Amendment should be disagreed to, and the original word re-inserted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he would accept the suggestion; and the word "shall" was re-inserted in place of "may."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. MORLEY said, he submitted to the Amendment, providing for rent due to the landlord, under protest, as he did not see why a landlord should have a preference over other creditors, to which he had before objected.

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Jessel, Mr. Morley, and Mr. Rathbone:—To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[*Lords*]—[Bill 215.]

COMMITTEE.

[*Progress 27th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BRUCE said, he wished to state to the Committee the course which the Government intended to pursue with regard to the division which took place last week with reference to the interpretation of the word "heritors" in Clause 1. The House was aware that, under the Bill, no change was proposed to be made in the constitution of the Governing Bodies of the parochial schools, until the conversion of those schools into national schools. That provision was inserted according to the recommendation of the Commissioners, and it was understood that, upon the whole, the recommendation met with the approval of the Scotch Members on both sides. Acting upon that belief, the Government had left that provision untouched. But when the Bill was last in Committee, although on a division the clause as it stood was carried by a majority, he understood that in the minority was a considerable majority of the Scotch Members, and it was said by the Lord Advocate that abstractedly he fully concurred with those who opposed the interpretation clause as it stood in the Bill, but that he waived his objection, as the provision in question was the result of a compromise. On consideration of this matter, the Government being most anxious that this measure should become law this Session—they were of opinion that they would best consult the feelings of the large majority of the Scotch Members, as well as of Scotch people generally, if they adopted the proposal which was in substance made by the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), that restored the heritors to the position which they occupied before the Act of 1803—in fact, to vest in all heritors who contributed to the support of the schools a share in the management. The effect of this would be that the parochial schools would be no longer included in the operation of the Bill, and no provision would be made for their conversion into national schools. If the Committee would adopt this suggestion a large number of Amendments would disappear, and the progress of the Bill would be greatly facilitated. The clauses necessary to give effect to this arrangement would have to be adopted on the Report. He hoped that this concession on the part of the Government would be received by the Committee as an earnest of their desire to give effect to the Bill during the present Session. There would remain only one question of great difficulty and importance, and that is the question raised by the 66th clause, as to terms under which denominational schools may, under certain circumstances, be permitted. With respect to this question, also, the Government had taken into their consideration the express desire of this House that some limit should be placed, if possible, on the action of the Commissioners, and when that clause was before the Committee, the Government would state what these limits would be. Under these circumstances, he hoped they would have the assistance of the Committee in pressing forward this measure with speed. Of course, it was not desired that questions involving so much of importance should be disposed of lightly, or without discussion; but he trusted that the discussion which might take place would be conducted with the full conviction that the measure could only be carried during the present Session of Parliament by the exercise on the part of hon. Members of much self-command in the duration of their speeches, and that they would so conduct the business that the Bill might pass through Committee that evening, leaving for the succeeding night the discussion of the very important questions which might arise on the Report.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he should endeavour to exercise the self-command enjoined by the right hon. Gentleman; but he thought it desirable that Scotch Members should express their opinions upon the course the Government had pursued. It was impossible not to acknowledge that the concessions made by the Government on the points referred to were of the utmost importance. They had conceded that the point of the old parochial schools of Scotland should be managed on this broad principle, which he believed this House would adopt, and which he believed no other House would controvert —namely, that those should manage the schools who paid for them. That was a very reasonable demand; and although it was refused last Tuesday, he congratulated the Government upon having conceded what they unwisely refused last Tuesday. They had, by the means adverted to by the right hon. Gentleman, got the whole of the large sum paid by the heritors, amounting to £48,000 a year, for the purpose of education, and it was satisfactory to think that this large sum would be, for all future time, set apart for the education of the people of Scotland. He did not pretend to say that there were not many points on which serious discussion might not arise; but he would say that the concessions made by the Government were of such a nature that he thought it would be very unwise on their part to refuse to pass the Bill.

MR. ORR EWING said, that anyone who had read the Preamble of the Bill would see how different was the measure they had now to discuss from that which was originally introduced. They were now told that the parochial schools were to be exempted from the operation of the Act — that they were now to have the power of converting them into national schools; but that schools which now afforded one-half of the education given in Scotland were to be kept from the operation of the Government Bill. Could this be called a national system? The hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Anstruther) had said that his great reason for withdrawing his opposition to the Bill was that the burden formerly imposed on the heritors for the maintenance of the old parochial schools—a burden to which they had been too long solely subject—was to be continued. Now, he thought the retention of this burden would be most unfair; and unless the Lord Advocate gave a pledge that he would deduct a sum of money, equivalent to the sum now assessed on the heritors, for the maintenance of the old parochial schools from the new assessment that might be necessary for the building of the new schools, and unless the Lord Advocate also undertook that the old parochial schools which belonged to the Free Church of Scotland were not to be taken over and become national schools, he thought the measure ought to be withdrawn.

MR. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, the Home Secretary had expressed a desire that the Bill should proceed, and had spoken as if such had all along been the earnest desire of the Government. If this were so, he (Mr. Aytoun) should like to be informed why the feeling of the Government on the subject was so very different in the early part of the Session? The Bill was brought down from the Lords on the 14th of June. At that time the Irish Church Bill had left the Commons, and it might have been supposed that the Government would have found time to consider what, with the exception of the Irish Church Bill, he regarded as the most important measure of the Session. But what had been the conduct of the Government? Instead of considering this Bill with the utmost expedition, they did nothing. They allowed the Bill to remain as it was. They did not read it a second time until the 12th of July; and when it was read a second time, it was at so late an hour that it was impossible to discuss its principles. They were then told that they were to have the discussion upon going into Committee; but when the Bill came to that stage, they were requested by the Home Secretary not to discuss it, inasmuch as if they did discuss it, it would be fatal to the passing of the Bill. Was it not an extraordinary circumstance that the Government, being so anxious to pass the Bill, should have allowed it to remain so long in the House before it was read a second time? The impression on the minds of most persons in Scotland was that the Bill was not to be carried through this Session. ["No, no!"] Certainly; everyone he had spoken to was of that opinion. Now, however, when it had arrived at a period at which it was nearly impossible to pass the Bill, the Government had suddenly become alive to the importance of its being passed. He should like to have some explanation with regard to the reasons which induced the Government to take their present course. They were told that this was an undenominational Bill, and that therefore those who were in favour of such a measure ought to accept the Bill, lest in the next Session they had put upon them a Bill which would in that respect be worse. The Bill was not, on the face of it, a denominational Bill; but there were clauses in it which made it, in a sense, worse than if it were openly and honestly denominational. One clause empowered the Government to name a Board of gentlemen who were to have adequate salaries, and who were to sit at Edinburgh; and another gave to this Board the power to recommend to the Privy Council that denominational grants should be given to particular schools. Reading these two clauses together, how could it be said that this was an undenominational Bill? Why was this change made? Because they were told there was a Roman Catholic population in Scotland which must be excepted from the general provisions of the Bill. It ought to be known that the reason the Bill had to be passed through the House at this late period of the Session was that the Government had thought fit and proper to make it a denominational Bill, for the sake of conciliating and obtaining the support not of the people of Scotland, but of a certain section of the people of Ireland. He would not discuss whether the latter should exercise so much influence over the internal affairs of Scotland; but it ought to be known that this was so, and that the Bill, which had been deferred to the end of the Session, was to be pushed forward in order that it might be passed through the House in this ostensibly undenominational but really denominational form. If the Government were determined to pass the Bill, it would be futile for Scotch Members to oppose it; but it ought to be known that the responsibility of passing the Bill in this form lay upon the Government, and, personally, he would not participate in that responsibility. It was a mistake to suppose that a Board, nominated by the Government, and dependent upon the Government, even though it were composed of Scotchmen and sat in Edinburgh, would represent Scotch feeling, which demanded a system of management different from that which prevailed in England. Such a Board, nominated by and dependent on the Government, afforded no safeguard against the establishment in Scotland of a system which would be unsatisfactory to the Scotch people. He considered it his duty to protest against the denominational nature of this Bill and to guard against the imputation that by silence he had acquiesced in the passing of it.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he was one of those who recently stated that if the question was simply a vote for the Bill as it stood, or for no Bill at all, he should have decided for no Bill at all. But since that time the Government had considered the expressed opinion of the majority of the Scotch Members—not of the Scotch supporters of the Government, but of Scotch Members of all parties—and had consented to the important improvements which had been announced by the Home Secretary. Those changes went so far in the right direction, that he should cordially vote for the Bill in its present form. The question of opening up the management of the parish schools was not founded upon any new principle of democratic rights, but upon the principle of being guided by the wisdom of our ancestors. It was proposed to return to the principle enacted in 1696, that every heritor paying for the support of the schools should have a vote in the appointment of the schoolmaster. This principle was one to which no one could, in his opinion, deny the quality of soundness. The concession made was one which strict justice required, and strict justice would have been violated by any other arrangement being made. The next question related to the leaving out the parish schools from the operation of the Bill. Nobody could forget the praises showered on the parish schools from the other side of the House, as if they were all perfection, and the only means by which education in Scotland had been rendered what it was. The course followed by the Government ensured the maintenance of this system, and if the schools were perfect in the past, they would remain perfect — the Bill providing additional schools for large masses of the people. With regard to the extra schools, the cost would fall much more largely upon the towns, where additional schools were most wanted, than on the rural districts, and would not affect the landowners more than the occupiers, as the proposed rate was to be equally divided between both classes.

SIR JOHN OGILVY had not heard the statement of the Home Secretary; but from what he had been told of its purport he had no hesitation in saying that, unsatisfactory as the Bill was before, it was now more unsatisfactory still. Many Scotch Members had been left in ignorance of the compromise which had been come to, while there had been no opportunity for Scotch Members to communicate with their constituents. The Bill was called the Parochial Schools Bill, but he was told the parochial schools were to be expunged from it. With the view of postponing legislation to another Session, he moved that the Chairman leave the Chair, and, if supported by a sufficient number of Scotch Members, he would press the Motion to a division.

LORD ELCHO would not detain the Committee, but he could not refrain from remarking on the position in which the Scotch Members found themselves. This was a most important question affecting Scotland; it had a place in the Queen's Speech, and yet what was the position in which it stood? There were two prints of the Bill in the other House, there had been two in this; and in Committee in this House, after a division on a most important point, which was carried against a majority of the Scotch supporters of the Government—who were ready, to quote their own words, to support the Government through thick and thin — a Cabinet Council was convened, and a certain decision come to. That decision was to alter one of the main features and characteristics of the Bill. He did not say whether the change was right or wrong; but what was the position in which Scotch Members found themselves within a few days of the close of the Session? They were summoned to meet the Home Secretary at half-past two o'clock that day —a most unusual proceeding, and, after discussion, a Vote was taken—another unusual proceeding—on the question whether the Bill should be proceeded with, about twenty-three voting one way and seven or eight the other. The majority would support the Government through thick and thin against those who wished the matter to be properly and fairly considered, and who wished that no step should be taken without the utmost caution and deliberation, and with the full knowledge of everybody concerned. On such a question Members ought to have time to consult their constituents, and they had not been afforded an opportunity of doing so; but upon the fifth re-print of the Bill, at ten minutes to four o'clock that day, they were told to say, "Yes" or "No," whether the Bill should proceed. With great respect to the Government, he must say this was not a satisfactory way of legislating on a great question affecting any country, and it was unfair to Scotch Members to put them in such a position. He entered his deliberate protest against this mode of conducting Scotch business.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he trusted that an English Member might be permitted to say a few words upon a matter which might be supposed to be of interest only to Scotch Members. With every respect for the Scotch Parliament which sat upstairs, he would suggest that English Members were entitled to have some further acquaintance with this Bill. When he looked at the history of the Bill he was really astonished at the course which had now been taken, because it was calculated to lead that as well as the other House into difficulties to which they ought never to be subjected. The Bill was introduced into the House of Lords in order that it might receive the most ample discussion. Great alterations were made in it in the other House; but when it came down to that House a Motion was made by the Lord Advocate to go into Committee *pro formâ* upon it, in order that it might be re-printed. When this was done, the Bill of the Lords was found to be practically done away with; but the Bill which remained was at least supposed to contain the matured opinion of the Government, and to be the measure which it was their wish to submit to the House. Last Tuesday the Government called upon the House to support them upon a particular clause of the Bill; but now this point was given up, and the Bill was so altered that while the hon. Member who had just spoken said that if the Bill were put to the vote as it was orignally printed he must give his negative to it, yet now it was altered he said he could support it. What was he, as an English Member, to think of such a Bill? It was all very well for Scotch Members to meet upstairs and say that they were satisfied; but the House had nothing before it except the Bill, and he could not conceive any greater difference between two measures than between the Bill of the Lords and the measure as it was now proposed to be finally amended. The onus of amending the Bill, which ought to have been thrown upon the Government, was now thrown upon the Members of that House. Even the Amendments of the noble Duke the Secretary for India and of the Members of the Government in the other House had been altered—and yet the House of Commons was called upon at the last moment to take a new Bill upon the mere statement of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, without a single line of it being before them. It was proposed to alter the Preamble, to take out the parish schools of Scotland, and to put upon a new class of heritors burdens to which they had never before been subjected. ["No!"] At all events, it was proposed to give a new management to the schools. [Mr. BRUCE: It only reverts to the old management.] Well, but it took away, at any rate, the management on which the House went to a division last Tuesday, and it made all these alterations at a moment's notice. If the hon. Member for Dundee (Sir John Ogilvy) went to a division, looking to the great inconvenience, both to that and the other House of Parliament, of the course pursued by the Government, he should certainly vote with him.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the complaint of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) was considerably reduced in dimensions when the facts were stated. The Bill was introduced into the House of Lords in the month of February. It was founded upon the recommendations of the Education Commissioners, which were a compromise between the opposing views of the two parties who were anxious for national education. The Government were not altogether responsible for the delay which had occurred, because the other House did not send the Bill down until the 14th of June, having postponed the second reading until after the county meetings in April and the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church. The House of Lords exercised its privilege to alter the Bill to a very large extent. It was essential that the Government should offer the Bill to the House of Commons in the shape in which they wished it to pass, and for that purpose the House went into Committee on the Bill, with a view to its being re-printed *pro formâ*. He was prepared to maintain that this was an altogether regular and constitutional proceeding. The Commissioners in the meantime proposed that the management should remain as it was; and that was the compromise which had been spoken of. But did the Lords respect that compromise? By no means. They not only dealt with the question of constitution, but they altered the incidence of taxation. As he had originally explained, it then became a matter of considerable doubt what course the Government were justified in adopting; but, wishing to occasion as little difference of opinion as possible, they decided to revert to the compromise agreed to by the Commissioners. They had treated the question fairly, for the Amendments had been upon the Paper for some considerable time. A division took place, when it appeared that not merely a majority of the Liberal Members, but a majority of the Members from Scotland, were opposed to the proposition of the Government, and, whatever they might have been formerly, were no longer prepared to accept the compromise proposed by the Commissioners. The Government accordingly, in the hope of passing the Bill, had yielded to that view; in doing so he maintained they were perfectly right, and after the concession he trusted that progress would be made with the Bill. True, it was late in the Session; but they knew that difficulties of a much more serious character than those surrounding the present measure had been got rid of in a very short time this Session. There was nothing novel, unreasonable, or unjust in the proposals of the Government, and hon. Members were just as well able to discuss them now as they would be with a month's preparation.

MR. J. LOWTHER thought the remarks of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate went strongly in support of the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Sir John Ogilvy), while the history of the Bill given by his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. G. Hardy) was admitted to be substantially correct. English Members undoubtedly had serious difficulties to contend with in approaching legislation purely applicable to Scotland; but they need not apologize, he thought, for interfering upon a measure relating to education, which had been so largely dealt with upon the hustings, and in which, moreover, principles might be introduced to be quoted hereafter as precedents elsewhere than in Scotland. His right hon. Friend (Mr. G. Hardy) had confined his review to proceedings in the House of Commons; but he (Mr. Lowther) had extended his researches further, and found that, since this measure had been first introduced this Session in "another place," there had been no less than five distinct Bills, which he now held in his hand, and which were miscalled "The Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill." In February last the Bill was introduced in the House of Lords, having been alluded to in the Queen's Speech—a fact in itself suggesting that the 2nd of August was by no means a suitable date for a practical discussion of the question. After it came into the House of Commons a course was taken by the right hon. and learned Lord which was certainly unusual, and if a precedent could be found for it he hoped it would not be again appealed to. All that had been done in "another place" by way of Amendment, after careful and deliberate consideration, was expunged by the right hon. and learned Lord, without any opportunity being afforded to the House of ascertaining the grounds on which the views of the Government differed from those of the majority in the House of Lords. Practically, the House was invited on the 2nd of August to initiate legislation on this subject. It might be said that the Bill having already passed the other House, there were still a sufficient number of days in which the measure might be passed. But what was the fact? As the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said of another Bill, at the fifty-ninth minute of the eleventh hour it would go up to the House of Lords not merely as a new Bill—that would be bad enough—but as a Bill re-constructed in a shape which practically had been considered and rejected already. What likelihood was there that a measure sent up in such a form and at such a time would be accepted?

MR. GRAHAM said, it struck him as strange that the Committee had spent much time in discussing whether the Government or the House of Lords was to blame, and whether the heritors had been well used, while very little had been said about the 80,000 children in Scotland who were crying out for education. The whole question was in such a state that the House could well consider it, and, looking back upon the abortive efforts of the last twenty years, he hoped the few precious hours that remained would not be wasted. He denied that this was a new Bill; there was nothing in it which in some shape or another had not been upon the Paper. Admitting that the desire of the Scotch people generally was in favour of an undenominational system of education, if that were possible, he asked whether they were by legislation to erect a barrier against the admission of the largest and most indigent class of children? He did not pretend to advocate or defend the course taken by the Roman Catholic clergy; but, as the House knew, with the influence which the Roman Catholic clergy possessed, they would not allow the children of their flocks to receive education in any schools which they distrusted; and the choice therefore lay between relaxing in some respects the notion of an undenominational system and leaving the children of Roman Catholics wholly outside the scope of this measure. If the people of Scotland were prepared to accept a wholly secular education, they would be entitled to impose on every peasant the duty of sending his child to school; but the moment religious considerations intervened, compulsory education became out of the question; for, though in social and secular matters the opinions of the majority might fairly govern, the moment religion entered into the question, the majority, however large and influential, had no right to control the conscience of the minority, however small. It was true that the people of Scotland desired an undenominational system of education, and that under the present system the Roman Catholic children were perfectly safe in Protestant schools. But would the Roman Catholics be equally satisfied; and should this principle be embodied in a Bill? He thought the very attempt to enforce such a system under this Bill would be the very way to make the Roman Catholic clergy hostile to it. The advantages offered by the Bill were that it localized the management of parish schools; that it provided for an extension of those schools; that it gave a rate in aid of education—which they had never yet had—and double grants in poor districts; and that it gave local management for the national schools. Under these circumstances he maintained that Scotch Members should cast aside all their private opinions upon secondary points, and should accept with thanks the Bill supported by the Government.

Mr. ELLICE merely rose to ask whether the definition of "heritors" under the alteration proposed by the Government would embrace the heritors under the old valuation only, or would also include the heritors under the new valuation? In the latter case he thought the Committee might be well content.

The LORD ADVOCATE replied that the Bill proposed to repeal the provisions of the Act of 1833, which limited the management of schools to heritors of £100, and to restore the law to what it was before that date, under which every heritor who was bound to pay the school rate had a voice in the management of the school.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY thought it would be as well if the Bill were to leave the parish schools out of the Bill altogether, and provide merely for education in the Scotch burghs.

Mr. CRUM-EWING thought that, as the Government had given way upon a very material point, the hon. Member for Dundee (Sir John Ogilvy) should withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, looking at the question from an educational point of view, he could not help thinking they had very nearly lost sight of what was after all the great object of the Bill. Scotland, advanced though it was in education beyond England and most civilized countries, and possessing a system of many centuries old to which she owed that state of advancement, was yet in danger of falling behind, because the custom of the country had outgrown the system of education. His hon. Friend (Mr. Graham) had under-stated the fact in saying that there were 80,000 children without an education. The Report of the Commissioners said that out of 510,000 children there were 92,000—or 18 per cent—not on the roll of any public school paid out of, or aided by, public grants, and that of the remaining 82 per cent a large proportion were receiving a very inferior education. With such facts as these before them, they might sink minor differences, and vie with each other in anxiety to devise some measure which would remove this great evil. This measure did propose to grapple with this evil, and he had never heard it disputed by anyone that by this Bill a machinery was set in motion which would meet the necessity, and cause that need to disappear. There had been discussion as to what kind of a Board should be established, what should be its powers, whether it should be appointed by the Government, and whether it should sit in Edinburgh or not; but he (Mr. W. E. Forster) had never heard it disputed that this Board would do its duty; on the contrary, it was admitted by the Scotch Members and the Scotch population that within three or four years such a Board would remove the glaring inconsistency between the present and the past history of Scotland. By that machinery Scotland would be supplied with sufficient schools. Then it should, in estimating the educational condition of Scotland, be remembered that all the existing schools were not good schools. The folly of postponement was not merely that there was this urgent necessity which ought to be supplied, but that the present educational agencies that were in Scotland were unable to perform their duty because of the suspense created by the knowledge that some great educational measure was in contemplation. A Commission had been appointed in 1864, and the Bill which was before the Committee was substantially the same measure as the Bill which was proposed by that Commission. It was asked—Why not confine the Bill to the burghs? But it was not merely the burghs which were suffering from want of education, though they, like the towns in some parts of England, were in a condition to excite the fears of all for the Empire. But the state in some country districts was still more deplorable, and it was shown by the Report of the Assistant Commissioners that unless some radical improvement took place in some country districts, in the course of a generation reading and writing would be unknown. It would, therefore, be a mockery if the Government were willing to consent to deal only with the burghs. The great benefit of the system was that it dealt with schools generally, and made it impossible that three or four years hence the condition of education in Scotland should be in its present state. He took a great interest in the matter, because of the Department with which he was connected, and because he felt that it had some connection with the great measure which was expected by the country with regard to education in England. Not that he expected hints from this Scotch measure, for he was perfectly aware of the different circumstances; but it would be an advantage to have one national system. The circumstances of England, Ireland, and Scotland respectively were different in respect of education, and a system of education which would be suitable for one of the three kingdoms, would not be, in all probability, suitable to either of the two others; but the fact that Scotland had adopted a system of national education, such as that which this Bill would provide, would no doubt greatly assist the Government in framing and passing educational measures for England and Ireland. Under all the circumstances he hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Sir John Ogilvy) would not persevere with his Motion.

SIR JOHN OGILVY, yielding to the suggestions of his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Graham), and his right hon. Friend the Vice-President of the Council, said he would withdraw his Motion.

MR. CRAUFURD said, he must complain that the hon. Member for Dundee should consent to withdraw his Motion. The Scotch Members had been gagged by the action of the Government in respect of this Bill. They had been refused an opportunity of discussing the measure; there had been no discussion on the second reading; and his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary objected to his attempt to raise one on the Motion for going into Committee. He denounced the measure as a denominational rather than a national system of education. This was not a national Bill, but a denominational Bill. Much as he was opposed to a denominational system, he would rather have an honest denominational Bill than one which professed to be a national, but which was used as an *ignis fatuus* to lure hon. Members, and which contained some of the most fatal elements of denominationalism. He had already said that there were two main features of the Bill which were of vital importance, and that unless these two were satisfactorily settled, he must oppose the Bill. These were the constitution of the Board, and the 63rd and 64th clauses, in which the denominational element most fatally resided; and if these two were satisfactorily settled, then the Scotch Members would be content to waive the question of opening up the parish schools, because they believed that a large proportion of them would be converted into national schools. He was not going to repeat the complaints that had been made as to the management of the Public Business this Session; but he asked the English Members if they would tolerate an Education Bill being taken for discussion on the 2nd of August, on the same evening that the Appropriation Bill was set down for second reading. He ventured to say that they would resent it as an outrage.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, he agreed

with the hon. Member that a mistake had been made in not debating principles more fully in the previous stages, for he believed that if such a discussion had taken place, it would have given the Bill momentum sufficient to carry it over the miserable obstacles about which they had been wasting so much time. He denied the accuracy of the assertion that the scheme proposed was not a national scheme — on the contrary, he contended that this was pre-eminently a Bill for establishing a national system of education. In the first place, it was national because in it, for the first time, the nation undertook the direct responsibility for providing schools. In the second place, he held it to be national because it would be no longer partial—all over the country, in burghs as well as in rural districts, in the Highlands and the Islands, as well as the mainland, henceforth there would be proper education for the children, for it would be the duty of the Board to ascertain what was wanted in every part of Scotland, and to provide according to the need. And lastly, it was a national as opposed to a denominational system. He did not say that the Bill retained no trace whatever of denominationalism. They could not expect that if the education of the country had been carried on for a generation under one system, in a single year they could sweep away every vestige of it; and he doubted even whether they would be prepared for the financial results of such a proposal. But the Bill did away with denominational inspection, and provided that parochial schools, which had not hitherto been examined by the Government at all, should be subject to national inspection. It was also undenominational in the sense that, although it permitted the existing denominational schools to continue, no new denominational schools could be set up, except under the narrowest possible limits. The chief thing that they ought to set before their minds was the picture of the miserable and uneducated children whose case this Bill was intended to meet. He believed that the numbers had been understated, and if the worse educated were to be brought to the level of the better educated parts of Scotland, it would be found that there were at least 100,000 children for whom provision must be made.

Colonel SYKES said, he was one of the eight independent Members referred to by his hon. Friend; and when the Lord Advocate to-day, at a meeting of Scotch Members, announced the important concessions made by the Government, he to give practical effect to their wish, proposed that hon. Members having Amendments on the Paper, should withdraw them; but he was met by a pretty general "No." He despaired, therefore, of getting the Bill through this Session. What was the urgency of the case? Was Scotland enveloped in such Cimmerian darkness as to require that a Bill should pass through the House at a railway pace in order to give her education? Certainly not. In London there were more uneducated children than in all Scotland. After the liberal proposals of the Government he should not oppose the Motion of the Lord Advocate.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair." —(*Sir John Ogilvy.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 36; Noes 113: Majority 77.

Clause 4 (Meeting of the board. Three members to be a quorum)—Clause A. (Board meetings.)

Mr. CRAUFURD said, they had had a long discussion on the constitution of the Board, and the Government had agreed to re-consider the question, and inform them at some future time what they intended to do. Before dealing with the powers and action of the Board they ought to know how it was to be constituted.

Motion made "That the Clause be postponed."—(*Mr. Craufurd.*)

The LORD ADVOCATE said, they might as well postpone the whole Bill as the clauses relating to the Board. When the proper time came he should give the required explanation as to the constitution of the Board.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY inquired of the Lord Advocate, whether all the meetings of the Board were to be open to the public?

The LORD ADVOCATE replied that he intended to agree to an Amendment, which was to be proposed by the hon. Member for Fifeshire (Sir Robert Anstruther), extending the open meetings to ordinary as well as to half-yearly meetings.

MR. ELLICE wished to know whether he had understood the Lord Advocate right when he thought he heard him say that the meetings of the Board were to be open to the public. How would the Board get on with their business if the public was to be admitted to all their proceedings?

COLONEL SYKES said, it was certainly understood at the meeting upstairs that all the meetings were to be in public.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE asked if it was seriously proposed that an excited public should be admitted to attend the proceedings of a Board consisting of only two or three members? The thing would defeat itself, for the Board would hold private meetings for the transaction of their business, and the public meetings would become a mere farce.

MR. BRUCE said, the reason why that concession was made by the Government was this—He agreed with his hon. Friend that it was absurd to talk of public meetings to be held of a Board consisting of only three gentlemen met to transact ordinary business; but it was impossible rightly to define the occasions when the public ought to be admitted. Take the case where the conduct of a schoolmaster was under discussion—or where denominational schools sought to be admitted. These were matters where the public ought to have security that the questions were fully considered, and, therefore, he thought they ought to be present.

MR. CRUM-EWING said, there was another reason which had not been mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. The Board would have powers of taxation, and, therefore, they ought to satisfy the public that these powers were reasonably exercised.

LORD ELCHO asked whether there was any precedent, either in England or Scotland for such a proposal as this—that an important Board like this should conduct its business publicly. It seemed to him to be a proposal to get in the thin end of the American wedge, where thousands took part in, and cheered the proceedings of an assembly. It would be contrary to the spirit of independence to have such a thing, because the Board might be under the terrorism or other demonstrations on the part of the public.

MR. M'LAREN said, it seemed to be forgotten that the Board would, on many occasions, sit as a court, and that representatives from local committees would be heard before them for and against the planting of a new school at a particular spot, or perhaps objecting to the adoption of a denominational school. The speaking would be not so much of the members of the Board as of those who came to plead their cause before them. It might as well be said that because the Judges of a court of law consisted of only three or four members, therefore the public should not be admitted.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, his first impression certainly was that it would be inconvenient that the Board should hold its meetings in public; but when he remembered that the Board would have great powers in determining where new schools were to be placed, in the adoption of denominational schools, and in the indirect power of taxation which they would confer, he changed his mind. He thought the inconvenience would be met by giving the Board power to sit in committee.

Motion *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Power to appoint committees) was *agreed to,* after a short discussion.

Clause 6 (Power to make rules and regulations which shall be laid before Parliament).

MR. ORR EWING moved in page 4, line 24, after "occasion," to insert "to frame a code for Scotland in accordance with the provisions contained in the Schedule A to this Act, and." It had been admitted that the manner in which education was carried on in Scotland differed very materially from the system adopted in England, and that the schools in Scotland not only gave the best elementary education, but also a higher education to youths intending to proceed to the Universities. They did not object in Scotland to payment by results; but they desired that the results should be taken from a higher standard, so that the schools included in this Bill might be improved rather than deteriorated by this operation. His object, therefore, was to intrust the initiative in framing this code to gentlemen of thoroughly Scotch feeling, who could appreciate the Scotch system of education and its superior advantages, leaving, however, the ultimate decision in the hands of the Committee of Council for Education, whose authority he had no wish to over-ride.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 24, after the word "occasion," to insert the words "to frame a code for Scotland in accordance with the provisions contained in the Schedule (A) to this Act, and."—(*Mr. Orr Ewing.*)

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the Government should feel it their duty to oppose the Amendment. The Government were quite aware of the different conditions of education in Scotland and England, and they had acknowledged that fact by appending to the Bill a Schedule which mentioned certain conditions which must be fulfilled in any Revised Code for Scotland. It would be for the hon. Member, when they got to the schedule, if he was not satisfied with the conditions, to move an Amendment; but it would be impossible for the Privy Council to continue to be responsible to the country for the distribution of the public money, and not to be the Department which had to submit to Parliament the condition on which that aid was granted.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR expressed a hope that the Amendment would not be pressed. It was perfectly conclusive that if the money was to be administered by the Privy Council, the code must be framed by them; but he had an Amendment in Schedule A, to the effect that before the Privy Council proceeded to make a code they should receive a Report from the Board as to peculiar requirements of Scotch education.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the Government would have no objection to accede to that Amendment.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE was inclined to place faith in the administration of those grants by the Privy Council. He thought it most important that everything with reference to the public contributions should be under the strictest regulations possible.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, it did not matter whether the taxation was national or local; what was wanted was that the Board should be in reality a Scotch Board, and that that Board should draw up any code of Scotch education that might be deemed necessary. They required that there should be a joint action between the Scotch Board and the Privy Council, and that the former should have the power to compel the Privy Council to take a Scotch view—or at any rate a reasonable Scotch view—of Scotch education.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the hon. Member (Mr. Craufurd) said that it made no difference whether the taxation was local or otherwise. The difference was this, did the hon. Member propose to entrust the Scotch Board with the key of the Imperial Treasury, with power to use what money they thought proper?

Mr. ORR EWING denied that his Amendment was intended to throw the cost on the State. It was intended rather to draw up a principle upon which the fund should be administered, and to insure for the education of Scotland at least as high a position as it had hitherto held. He did not wish that the Board should draw up a rule and act upon it; but that what they did should be submitted to the Privy Council before anything was done in regard to it. His Amendment had the approval of a majority of the Scotch Members, and he hoped the Government would accede to it.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, this was not the proper place for such an Amendment as that before the House. The proper time was on the consideration of the Schedule, and when that time came the Government would be prepared to accept an Amendment, the effect of which would be "that the rules are to be drawn up after receiving a report from the Board as to the modifications of the Revised Code that may be suitable for Scotland." He thought this ought to satisfy the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment. There were things in the Revised Code which would not suit the case of Scotland, and those could be amended at the proper time. Although, perhaps, they could not pride themselves upon the state of elementary education in Scotland, it was in the main satisfactory; while the Privy Council was prepared to give a bonus to higher education by making an allowance for four years longer in respect of the age during which the attendance of children at school was followed by an allowance.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, his intention was not to take the key out of the hands of the Privy Council; but that there should be two keys, of which the Council should hold one and the Board the other, and he did not wish the purse to be opened unless with the consent of the holders of both keys.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought the Amendment just referred to by the Lord Advocate would meet the case.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 17; Noes 81: Majority 64.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Parochial and parliamentary schools shall be old national schools, and shall continue to be managed as at present)—CLAUSE B. (Vote of heritors in election of schoolmasters).

MR. LOCH moved to omit the words "every parochial school and," his object being to exclude parochial schools from the operation of the Bill, so far as the powers of converting the parochial schools into national schools. He wished to preserve the system which had produced in Scotland such splendid results, and had brought about an amount of general information and intelligence which was not eclipsed by any other part of the United Kingdom. While they were quite right in endeavouring to establish a system to remedy any deficiencies that had arisen, why should they not preserve that which they knew to be good and efficient? The feeling of the people of Scotland generally was in favour of the maintenance of the parish schools; but the people also desired that the management should embrace a larger number of heritors, and that the schools should cease to be connected exclusively with the Established Church. It was obvious that those who contributed towards the maintenance of the schools should share in the management, and now that so large a proportion of the people had ceased to belong to the Established Church, it was but reasonable to require that the management should extend beyond the ministers of that Church. Another important aspect of the question was the amount levied throughout Scotland; £40,000 or £50,000 a-year could not be enough for the purposes of education, and it was, therefore, important to retain the large endowment which now existed. He was glad to know that his Amendment was not to be opposed by the Government.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, this Amendment was a necessary consequence of one which was discussed and settled at an early period of the evening; but he thought the best course would be to strike out the words of the clause from line 14 to the end—

> "Every private school and every parochial school is hereby declared to be a national school, and shall, from and after the passing of this Act, be vested," &c.

There were many other useful and important provisions applying to parochial schools.

MR. LOCH expressed his willingness to adopt the suggestions made.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY hoped the Lord Advocate did not intend to change the name "national schools."

MR. LOCH then withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Union of parochial schools).

MR. MILLER said, he had three Amendments to propose in relation to this subject. First, of all, he wished to strike out the words in the clause, "and minister," in lines 20 and 25, his object being to take away the denominational character of the schools. As he understood the Government, they desired to liberalize the heritors as far as possible, and the object of his Amendments was similar. So long as the minister was a member of the Governing Body of the schools in question, they would be to all intents and purposes denominational. In parishes where the population was small—in the Highlands, for example—the parochial ministers had the whole say, so far as the schools were concerned, the heritors being mostly absent, and the schools were entirely under his management. He hoped the Government would adopt the Amendment.

MR. CRUM-EWING supported the Amendment. The present state of things was most anomalous, and the Lord Advocate should, in conformity with his own principles, be prepared to place all denominations on an equality. It was well known that the Established Church did not comprehend above one-third of the people.

MR. CRAUFURD believed that the proposals of the Government could not be completely carried out unless this Amendment were carried.

Mr. ELLICE also urged upon the Government the propriety of getting rid of the clerical element in the management of the schools.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, although a member of the Established Church, he was opposed to the invidious distinction which it was now sought to remove. He had said over and over again in Scotland that he thought that if one minister were put upon the board all the ministers in the locality ought to be put upon it; but that expression of opinion was invariably received with marks of disapproval. People in Scotland said—it was not his own opinion—that if three or four ministers were placed on the managing committee of a school it would be quite impossible to transact business of any kind. As they had to choose between putting no ministers on the managing body and putting all, it seemed to him highly desirable to adopt the Amendment.

Mr M'LAGAN thought that they should pause before they struck out the word "minister." In many parishes there would be no one to manage the schools if the minister were shut out. He rather approved of the levelling-up system, and thought all the ministers should be members of the board.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, this question was not without embarrassment. In a country split up as Scotland was into at least three large denominations, it would not be desirable that one minister alone should manage the schools; but, on the other hand, it was not desirable, in his opinion, that no minister should be capable of sitting on the board. There could be no doubt that the clergy had rendered great service in the management of parochial schools. Although he wished to destroy the denominational character of the schools, he did not wish to destroy their religious character; and he had no doubt that under a freer system of management ministers of different denominations would act harmoniously. The Amendment only applied to the case of a combination of parishes for school purposes, and he thought it would be best to have the question raised under its general aspect, and to determine distinctly whether ministers should or should not take part in the management of parochial schools. That they had done so since 1696 there could be no doubt.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR was of opinion that, under the circumstances of the case, and as the heritors were to a certain extent to be doubly taxed, the Committee ought to give them the parochial schools under the same management as at present, which would not be done if the minister were taken away.

Mr. MILLER said, he understood that the interpretation of the word "heritors," as used in the Bill, was all heritors on the valuation-roll; and therefore the management was already altered. The Government thought the constitution of the Board could not be kept as it was, and he (Mr. Miller) proposed further to liberalize it by striking out the word "minister." The minister did not contribute sixpence on account of his manse or glebe, and yet he had power, by his casting vote, to levy money from others.

Mr. BRUCE thought the object of his hon. Friend would not be gained by the adoption of his Amendment. It was not the intention of the Government to revoke the old legal arrangement of 1696, and he did not think it was desirable to open up such a large question then.

Mr. M'LAREN had objected from the first to the contemplated union of schools, which would compel many children to daily travel three or four miles to obtain education. He thought the clause very objectionable, and that it would be better to strike it out altogether.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY concurred in this opinion.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 10 *negatived.*

Clause 11 (Board, with the sanction of the Lords of the Treasury, may appoint special commissioners).

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE wished to move as an Amendment in the clause, line 10, after the word "Act," to insert—

> "Due regard being had to the number of private and endowed schools already existing in the parish or burgh, and the quality of the education furnished therein."

There was no doubt that both in England and Scotland private schools were popular among the working classes, and evidence had been given before the Duke of Newcastle's Commission of that fact. He thought, therefore, they ought not to discourage private schools.

THE LORD ADVOCATE suggested that the Amendment should run thus—

"Due regard being had to the schools already existing in the parish or burgh, and the quality of the education furnished therein."

MR. M'LAREN said, he was afraid that these words would not be held to be legally applicable to private schools, and thought it would be a great evil if they were not so. The Lord Advocate knew that in the city with which he was connected there were large private schools most successfully conducted. There was one Lancastrian school with 500 scholars, and why should the Commissioners set to work and erect another school next door to it?

After short conversation,

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that on the whole he would accept the Amendment as originally proposed.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Board with the sanction of a majority of the trustees, managers, or proprietors of any school, may adopt any school).

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE then moved the insertion of the following words after the word "board" on line 29:—

"And it shall be the duty of such special commissioner or commissioners to inquire into the nature and amount of the funds devoted to the maintenance or education of young persons, and they shall also inquire into the administration or management of schools wholly or in part supported by endowments, and to the system and course of study pursued therein, and to report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any and what changes in the administration and use of such endowments are expedient, by which their usefulness and efficiency may be increased."

MR. M'LAREN thought it would be inexpedient to introduce these words. He entirely approved of the object desired, but he should like to see a Commission to inquire into educational endowments in Scotland. These were estimated by the Member for the University of Edinburgh at £150,000 a year, while the whole payments by the heritors of Scotland were only £48,000. He believed that the parties charged with the administration of these endowments would not open their doors so freely to a subordinate of a subordinate—as a Commissioner from the Board would be—as to a Commission appointed by the Crown.

THE LORD ADVOCATE would not object to the Amendment if the word "board" were substituted for "special commissioners."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 *struck out.*

Clause 14 (School committee to take proceedings to erect school).

MR. CRAUFURD said, the object of this clause was to compel the erection of schools, whether the rate-payers wanted it or not, and he thought that, before agreeing to it, they ought to know who the Board was. The powers given to the Board were of a very despotic character, and there was no power of appeal.

THE LORD ADVOCATE observed that, under the 31st section of the clause, every order of the Board was subject to appeal to the Home Secretary.

MR. CRAUFURD said, the appeal was from a Board of which the Lord Advocate was a member, and the only information which the Home Secretary could receive about it was from the Lord Advocate. What was that but an appeal from Philip to Philip?

MR. CRUM-EWING stated that there was considerable alarm about the clause in Scotland. There would be no use of the Bill, unless the power to put down schools was given to some one; but some alarm was felt at being put at the mercy of the Edinburgh lawyers.

MR. M'LAREN said that this clause ought to be watched with great jealousy. There could be no doubt that the opinion of the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General would be taken by the Board before pushing any matter to extremity, and the appeal, therefore, would practically be from the same Judge to the same Judge. He had the strongest possible objection to the Law Officers of the Crown being on the Board.

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 128; Noes 11: Majority 117.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (New schools to be "new national schools," and to be managed by school committee).

Clause 16 (School committee may elect teacher, &c.).

Agreed to, after short discussion.

Clause 17 (Combined national school).

Mr. ORR EWING proposed to substitute £50 instead of £35 as the minimum for schoolmasters' salaries. He wished to remind the House of what was expected from these schoolmasters. They were expected to have a University education, and to be able to teach Latin, and Greek, and French, and geography. He believed that the welfare of Scotland depended more upon the education of the schoolmasters than upon anything else, and he hoped the Scotch members would support him in this small measure of justice to these industrious, hard-working men.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR observed that there were several other Amendments nearly to the same effect. He would raise the minimum to £50; but after the word "pounds" he would insert "nor more than one hundred," which should be the maximum salary.

Mr. M'LAREN thought the minimum should remain as stated in the clause. That, it should be recollected, would not be the whole income of the teacher. Besides the Privy Council grant, the schoolmaster would have a free house, garden, and the school fees.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, nobody would expect a good master for a low salary; but it was admitted on all hands that there were parts of the country on which it would press very hard indeed to give the schoolmaster £50. He should therefore vote for keeping the sum at £35.

The LORD ADVOCATE pointed out that £35 was not the salary to be paid generally; but the lowest sum that would be given. When the subject was considered in 1861, the minimum was fixed at £29. He should support the Amendment of the hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh for fixing the maximum salary at £100.

Mr. FORDYCE hoped the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire would press his Amendment to a division. One great ground for supporting the Bill was the hope that it might raise the status of the schoolmasters.

Mr. ORR EWING said, he would withdraw his Amendment, hoping, after the expression of opinion which had been given, that no parish would take advantage of the limit of £35 to pay a schoolmaster so low a sum.

Clause amended by the insertion of the words "nor more than one hundred;" Clause further amended and *agreed to.*

Clause 18 *agreed to.*

Clause 19 (Conversion of old national schools into new national schools).

Major WALKER *moved* the insertion in line 38, after the word "the," of the words "heritors and minister, or." He said it was only fair that the power proposed to be given to the school committees under the new arrangements, to combine and employ pupil teachers on special subjects, should be extended to the old parochial schools. This was the object of his Amendment.

Mr. MILLER *moved,* as an Amendment to the proposed Amendment, the omission of the words "and minister."

Mr. GRAHAM said, some hon. Members appeared to regard ministers as firebrands. He suggested that the difficulty might be got over by some words in the interpretation clause.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, this question of the minister had been ingeniously evaded the last time, but it had now come up again, and he hoped the difficulty would be fairly met by a distinct statement from the Government. What the Scotch Membsrs wanted to know was, whether they were to have a thorough and honest liberalizing of the parochial schools in the sense contemplated by the division on Tuesday last against the proposals then made by the Government.

The LORD ADVOCATE thought there were no grounds whatever for the remarks just made by the hon. Member. Since 1696 there could be no doubt that ministers had a share in the control of these schools.

Mr. M'LAREN objected to the words proposed to be inserted altogether.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, there was a good deal in the objection of the hon. Member for Edinburgh, and he thought that the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire had better prepare a clause which should be entirely devoted to the parish schools.

Lord GARLIES asked whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman accepted the words of the Amendment, because they had already been twice put aside with his assent?

THE LORD ADVOCATE was perfectly prepared to accept the clause he had indicated.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 20 *struck out.*

Clauses 21, 22, and 23 *agreed to,* with Amendments.

After short discussion, House *resumed;* Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords' Amendments *reported.*

MR. S. MORLEY said, he wished to take that opportunity of stating his belief that the Government had fairly and honestly redeemed their pledge with regard to this measure, which was the best that had been secured during the lifetime of any trader in this country. The thanks of the trading community were due to the Government, and especially to the Attorney General for the manner in which he had listened to the representations of the Chambers of Commerce on this question.

Reasons *agreed to:* To be communicated to the Lords.

BISHOPS RESIGNATION BILL—[BILL 241.] [*Lords.*] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he wished to move the second reading of this Bill, and, if it were convenient to the House, to postpone any statement of the objects of the Bill until it could be taken at a more convenient hour, which he would secure by placing it as the first Order on Thursday. The hon. Member for Boston (Mr. Collins) had given notice of a Motion, from which he gathered that the hon. Member desired that the Bill should not be proceeded with. But he wished the hon. Member to observe the effect of an Amendment which he proposed to move in the Bill. An Amendment had been introduced into the Bill in the Lords which very materially altered its character, and introduced subjects of difficulty and complexity not originally included in the measure. He referred to the 3rd clause, which made the Bill applicable to physical incapacity for the purpose of appointing coadjutor Bishops. That was not at all in harmony with the general structure of the Bill, and he wished the House to consider the Amendments he would place on the table to-night, and how the Bill would stand in the event of those Amendments being adopted. He moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. W. E. Gladstone.*)

MR. COLLINS said, he did not object to that part of the Bill which applied to resignation; but he hoped that, if the Bill were to proceed this Session, all the clauses with reference to the appointment of coadjutor Bishops would be dropped by the right hon. Gentleman. The Bill might have been sent down from the other House three months ago, seeing that they had nothing to do there but idle away their time in the early part of the Session; and he hoped, taking into account that it was a measure of so much importance, it would not be proceeded with at a period when it could not be adequately discussed.

MR. HENLEY said, the first clause of the Bill appeared to him, to say the least of it, to be rather oddly worded. It stated that an Archbishop or Bishop was canonically to resign his benefice, and then went on to state that that was to be done only if he were incapacitated by mental or physical infirmity. The same words "mental infirmity" were used in the second provision of the Bill, in which the process was rendered compulsory. The difficulty lay in supposing that a different meaning was to be attached to those words in the same document. If mental infirmity existed to a degree which produced complete mental incapacity, he did not see how a Bishop could canonically resign, or an Archbishop report to the Crown that he was infirm. He also saw another difficulty in the Bill as it stood. It was set forth that an Archbishop or Bishop was as a preliminary matter canonically to resign, and afterwards that the Crown was to be satisfied by proof that he was either mentally or bodily incapable. But should the proof fail, in what position, he should like to know, would things then be placed? If a see had been canonically resigned it could not be taken up again, and if the proof failed it was not easy to perceive what was to be done. He quite concurred in thinking that it would be inconvenient to discuss a Bill of so much importance at so late an hour, and under all the circumstances of the case, he thought the wisest course to adopt would be to pass it only for one year.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS) BILL.

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen.*)

[BILL 238.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. AYRTON moved the addition of a proviso at the end of Clause 22, defining further the relative rights and liabilities of landlord and tenant with respect to the payment of rates.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. AYRTON said, he wished to call attention to the clause which was introduced into the Bill on Saturday on the Motion of Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens—

> "That it shall not be lawful for the Metropolitan Board of Works to sell or let, whether on lease or otherwise, any portion of the lands now vested in said Board for the purpose of a park or other place of recreation."

The clause as it stood was extremely ambiguous, and it was difficult to know what interpretation ought to be put upon it. The Act authorizing the Metropolitan Board of Works to purchase land expressly declared that they should be empowered to purchase such land as they might think fit for the construction of a park, and that they should be at liberty to sell any surplus land not required for that purpose. Such were the provisions contained in two Local Acts already passed—one for the construction of a park at Finsbury, and the other for the construction of a park at Southwark. Now, it was quite obvious that the Board, on the faith of those Acts, had been encouraged to make larger purchases than were necessary for the mere construction of a park, in each case feeling that they might re-imburse themselves by the sale of the surplus lands. Of the authority to sell them, however, the present clause was evidently intended to deprive the Board, and the Government ought not, he thought, to acquiesce in such an arrangement, especially when it was borne in mind that some hon. Members had, as he had been informed, voted for the clause with the idea that it was necessary for the preservation of the parks themselves intact. If that were its only object he should offer no opposition to it, although even then he should look upon it as entirely irrelevant and as by no means required. But it affected the rights of the rate-payers of the metropolis, by declaring in effect that a special grant should be made for the benefit of two or three parishes. If the parishes in question wished to make any application to Parliament, with the view of having the surplus lands in question appropriated to particular purposes, it was open to them to do so next Session. He had the authority of the Metropolitan Board of Works to say that no step would be taken between this and the next Session of Parliament for dealing with that surplus land, in order that the parishes might have the opportunity of prosecuting their views in the only way in which they ought to do so—namely, by Private Bill. Therefore there was no ground for that hasty and unjust legislation, and with that assurance he hoped the Committee would have no difficulty in striking out that clause. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving to leave out the clause.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause (Park lands vested in the Metropolitan Board of Works.)—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

MR. W. M. TORRENS said, that before putting on the Paper notice of his intention to propose the insertion of that clause, he had consulted the Chairman of Committees as to its strict regularity, as, without the sanction of that authority, he should have hesitated to take a step so important as to move the clause to which he had the good fortune to obtain the assent of the House. He must at once join issue, as he did on Saturday, with the Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Ayrton), and deny that that was an attempt by a clause in a Public Bill to deal with that which was first enacted in a Local and Private Bill. When he introduced to the first Commissioner of Works, in April last, a deputation from the neighbourhood affected by that question, he took care to go to the officers of that House, who were its officers when the Bill of 1857 was originally passed, and inquire what was the nature of that Act. He learnt that it was a hybrid Act, and that, consequently, its Amendment might be sought by a Bill like the present one. He denied that the Act of 1857 could be fairly described as a Local Act. It was introduced during the Ministry of Lord Palmerston; and Lord Palmerston, no inexperienced authority as to the rules of that House, volunteered, on behalf of his Government, to move a large grant of money in aid of the objects then contemplated. The Bill was promoted by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and was carried by their influence, with the assistance of the Government. It was not a Private, but a Public Act, and it belonged to the class of measures familiarly called "hybrid Bills." The Reports of the Board of Works, on which it was supported, were to the effect that they sought powers from Parliament to complete the drainage of the metropolis, with the promise and upon the undertaking that they would create public parks, where they were expedient and necessary, in the metropolis. After that Bill passed, the Board of Works, in the following Session, came to Parliament for new powers, including the power to mortgage 3*d.* in the pound of the metropolitan rates to raise £3,000,000; and the inducement held out to the House to pass that Bill was composed in part of the promise made officially that the Metropolitan Board of Works intended to devote £216,000 to the formation of a park in Finsbury, and a further sum for a park in Bermondsey. His case was that that Board had broken faith with Parliament and with the people of London, because, instead of so expending those sums, on the faith of expending which they obtained the power of mortgaging 3*d.* in the pound of the metropolitan rates and raising £3,000,000 sterling, they had expended the money neither in the one case nor in the other; and he asked the House not to rescind its vote of Saturday, because, to do that, would be to encourage breaches of contract by municipal bodies. On the 18th of April, 1859, after they had got that Act on those pretences and promises, the Chairman of the Board of Works wrote a letter to the Home Secretary for the time being, in which he recurred to the conditions on which the Act had been passed, and stated that among the most important objects of the measure was the establishment of those two parks. The people of London, therefore, did not come now to that House to sue in *formâ pauperis*, but they asked that they might not be robbed of their own money. And he hoped the House, after the vote it had given within the last forty-eight hours on that matter, would not now undo that act of justice. It was not true that the Board of Works had a discretionary power to sell portions of that land as they thought fit. The words of the statute, which were very careful and precise, enabled the Board only to dispose of such lands as were not required for the purposes of the park. But was anybody prepared to stand up and tell the House that 115 acres were too much for the purposes of the health and recreation of a part of the metropolis whose inhabitants were to be counted by hundreds of thousands, and that twenty acres might be taken away? The metropolis was divided into nine Parliamentary cities and boroughs. The poorer population of the East-end, comprising the Tower Hamlets, the City, Hackney, Finsbury, and Southwark, was considerably over 1,500,000. Yet for parks they had, on the whole, only 460 acres; whereas, the genteel end of the town, with a smaller amount of population, and including Westminster, Lambeth, Chelsea, and Marylebone, had 1,460 acres in the shape of parks; or 1,000 acres more than the unfortunate people of the East-end of London, who were entitled to no less care and attention from that House than the inhabitants of the West-end. It was unworthy of a great and powerful Government to bring its gigantic power to bear on particular localities in this way; and he was sure they would not have long to wait before they would find discontent cropping up if they were to do acts of this kind.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he would ask the House to decide simply on the merits of the question. It appeared that in all cases in which the Metropolitan Board had taken land for the purpose of parks, it had always got power to sell a small portion, and why? Not to diminish the area of the park, but that the valuable frontage which would be created by the formation of the park should be reserved for the benefit of the rate-payers of the whole metropolis. Then there was this other point. It struck him that there was considerable force in the argument that where land for a park was taken in a populous district, the Board should have power to make what he should call "a fringe" to the park itself—that was, should have power to build a decent class of houses around the park, instead of allowing the miserable tenements that might be in the neighbourhood to stand around it, or contractors to come in and run up a wretched description of houses. It was a most expensive proceeding to construct parks in the midst of populous districts, and the least that could be done was to reserve a small portion of the land for the purpose of recouping some of the expenses incurred. He was informed that the land in question in the neighbourhood of Finsbury and Southwark Parks was worth £76,800, and that was a sum worth consideration. His hon. Friend complained that twenty acres were taken out of 115 and said it was too much. [Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS: Out of 250.] His hon. Friend would not allow that any one corner of the parks should be built upon now or at any future time. He agreed with his hon. Friend in much that he had said; but he thought he might ask the House not to vote for the retention of so stringent a clause. The difference between them was simply this—whether the hon. Member for Finsbury would not tie the hands of the Board too much, and thus really defeat the object he had in view. His hon. Friend would find that some of the metropolitan Members who supported him on a previous occasion would not now do so, because since the last division they had found out that the views of their constituents did not coincide with those of the hon. Member.

MR. HENLEY said, he was sorry the Government had tried to reverse what the House had done the other day. There was a very great, rapid, and unprecedented increase of population in the neighbourhood where these parks were, and whatever might have been considered suitable a few years back, everyone must admit that the spaces now open were not too much. There was a good deal of force in what the right hon. Gentleman had said about the profit that might be made by "a fringe" around the frontage. They all knew that the frontage near a park was very valuable; but "a fringe" was a very wide term, and when they came to talk of a fringe all round they might reduce the area very considerably. When they considered how densely the people were packed, what the effect upon their health of that dense packing was, how every day and every hour the population was increasing, and how the country and fresh air were being put further away from them, it was very unfortunate now that open spaces had been obtained, that every morsel of those spaces should not be kept open for the health of the people.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the Government had no desire whatever but that simple justice should be done, and he put it to the candour of the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. W. M. Torrens) that his statement as to the acreage of the parks available for the East-end and West-end of the metropolis respectively did not fairly represent the merits of the case. The Green Park, St. James's Park, and Hyde Park had not been purchased by the public money; they were Crown estates made over to the metropolis. And here he would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the whole of his speech appeared to be founded on a principle diametrically the reverse of what Parliament had deliberately adopted. The right hon. Gentleman had made an appeal to compassion, and said—"Assuredly you don't think these acres too much." But was Parliament to make parks for London, or was it not? If Parliament was to make parks for London, the cost must come upon the Consolidated Fund. But Parliament eight or ten years ago deliberately and advisedly set up a system of local government charged with the execution of public works, and, among others, with the formation of these parks. Surely that was a most important consideration. It was a most serious thing for Parliament to take this course, and then to say that the local authority so constituted should not deal with the matter in accordance with the rules already laid down, but that Parliament itself should step in and say upon what terms parks should be made. If this were done the rate-payers would not let the point rest there. Parliament had distinctly declared that the funds of the country at large should not go to make parks for London, that London must attend to its own wants in this respect, and had provided machinery for the purpose; if Parliament, however, interfered, a responsibility would be entailed which it must not shrink from discharging.

MR. COLLINS said, he thought the Prime Minister had over-stated the case in dealing with it as if the country did nothing for London. The country at large had done much for Battersea Park and the Royal Parks, and having thus contributed a rate-in-aid, the people of the country had a right to be heard when they expressed an opinion on the subject of parks to be made at the East-end. He hoped, however, that his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. W. M. Torrens) would so modify his proposal as to allow a smaller portion of the park than twenty acres, say ten acres, to be placed within the power of the Board of Works for appropriation.

DR. BREWER said, he should support the original proposition, giving the Board power to sell, because he desired other parts of London besides Finsbury to have parks; he could point out places in London which would be thankful for a fourth of the space Finsbury would gain by the Bill as it originally stood.

SIR HENRY HOARE said, the only argument in favour of the sale of the twenty acres of land was the fear that the rates on the metropolis at large would be increased. As he thought the richer portion of the metropolis—the West-end—could afford to bear a heavier burden in order to give the poorer portion—the East-end—a better park, he would vote with the hon. Member for Finsbury.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the question was not one of policy, as to how much the House would feel disposed to give or withhold, but was one of simple justice. A piece of land had been divided into two portions; one had been given to the people of Finsbury for a park, the other to the Metropolitan Board, as representing the rate-payers, and when the Board of Works came to Parliament asking for facilities to borrow money, the hon. Member for Finsbury asked the House to rob the rate-payers of their portion of the land in order to give it to the people of Finsbury; he, in fact, asked the House to impose a heavy burden on the rate-payers, in opposition to a bargain solemnly agreed to by Parliament.

MR. HINDE PALMER said, he had heard no reason whatever to justify him in voting in a contrary direction to that in which he voted on Saturday; though he thought the clause might be modified. It was never intended to divide the ground into park and building land, and he objected to describing the twenty acres as surplus land, because "surplus land," as applied to schemes ordinarily before Parliament, referred to land beyond what was necessary for the object in view, and this twenty acres was not more than sufficient for the park. The Finsbury Park Act gave power to the Metropolitan Board of Works to take 250 acres and to sell the surplus; but that Board only required 115 acres, and they now asked to apply to building purposes the proportion of twenty acres to 115, though the proportion originally named was that of twenty acres to 250 acres.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 56; Noes 79: Majority 23.

Another Amendment made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

CANADA (RUPERT'S LAND) LOAN (GUARANTEE) BILL.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to authorize the Treasury to guarantee the interest of a Loan not exceeding £300,000, to be raised by the Governor in Council of Canada, under the terms of an arrangement concluded with the Hudson's Bay Company for the surrender of Rupert's Land to Her Majesty; and to make provision for the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, of such sums as may be required to fulfil the said guarantee."

Resolution *agreed to:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. STANSFELD, and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 253.]

BROUGHTY FERRY PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

On Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the burgh of Broughty Ferry, *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE and Mr. ADAM.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 254.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 3rd August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham) * (263); Expiring Laws Continuance * (262).

Second Reading — Telegraphs (243); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment * (256); Public Works (Ireland) * (255); Clerks of Assize * (248); Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) * (246); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (251); Basses Lights, Ceylon, * (254); Criminal Lunatics * (247); Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (249); Militia Pay *; Militia (Ireland) * (252); Nitro Glycerine * (245); Railways Abandonment (249); Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment * (257); Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment * (232).

Committee—Report—Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds * (215); Land Tax Commissioners Names * (158); Dublin Freemen Commission (210).

Report—Fisheries (Ireland) * (236); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * (230).

Third Reading—Civil Offices (Pensions) * (157); Evidence Amendment * (260); Contagious Diseases (Animals) (261); Jamaica Loans * (204); Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal * (241); Millbank Prison * (234); Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) * (226); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2) * (136); Straits Settlements * (231), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Joint Stock Companies Arrangements * (167).

TELEGRAPHS BILL—(No. 243.)

(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, their Lordships would remember that an Act was passed last year enabling the Postmaster General to purchase the interests and property of the various telegraph companies of the United Kingdom, with a view to secure cheaper and extended telegraphic communication. Negotiations were entered into with those companies, and their machinery and accounts were carefully examined, the result being an agreement that twenty years' purchase should be paid. The companies, in the first instance, claimed in the aggregate the sum of £7,000,000 as the value of their property, but this was ultimately reduced to £5,220,000. The railway companies possessing lines had also to be arranged with; and this, and further expenses that had been incurred owing to the Government having taken upon itself the management of the telegraphs, and making them of the utmost utility to the public, raised the sum to £6,730,000, or, in round numbers, £7,000,000. If this sum were raised by loan at 3½ per cent, the annual interest would be £236,000. Now, according to the most careful calculations, the revenue likely to be derived was £673,828. In addition, however, to the interest, there would be various outgoings for salaries, the maintenance of the lines and instruments, way-leaves, and incidental expenses, the probable amount of which was £359,000. This would leave a surplus or profit of £77,000, which, if the capital were obtained at 3¼ per cent, would be raised to £94,000. They might reasonably expect, moreover, that this bargain, which he regarded as a good one at present, would become still better hereafter. It must be remembered that the business of the companies had for many years been steadily increasing, and it might be expected that the increased facilities and superior management of the new system would bring about a still further increase. Among those facilities might be mentioned the wires into every post-office where there was a money order office, the receipt of telegrams in all receiving houses and boxes, the payment by postage stamps, that they might be deposited for transmission in letter-boxes, and a uniform rate of 1*s*. This last, he thought, would more than counterbalance the abolition of 6*d*. messages in a few of the large towns, for the number of these bore a small proportion to the total number of messages. It was hoped, moreover, that before long the uniform rate might be reduced to 6*d*.; but it was thought best not to attempt too much in the first instance. Exception had been taken to the monopoly clause in some quarters; but it must be borne in mind that the price to be paid to the companies was a monopoly price; hence it was only fair that the Government should be protected against the contingency of being undersold and exposed to ruinous loss, while there was no fear that the Government would not be ready, at all times to adopt manifest improvements, and give the utmost accommodation to the public.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—(No. 261.)

(*The Lord President.*)

THIRD READING. AMENDMENTS.

Bill read 3^a, with the Amendments.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY *moved* an Amendment enabling railway companies to charge on owners of cattle the expense of disinfecting the trucks. The noble Chairman of Committees invariably opposed any attempt on the part of companies to raise the rates they had originally laid down, on the ground that they formed a contract with the public. Now, admitting this for argument's sake to be correct, justice required that no burdens should be imposed on the companies beyond those originally contemplated, and at the time when the tariffs were fixed it was plainly impossible to foresee the necessity of disinfection as a precaution against the cattle plague. He might be told that the expense would be small; but last year two new expenses —those of smoking carriages and of communication between passengers and guard—were cast on the companies, and many small items like this formed a heavy burden on the poorer companies, such as would account for the difficulties under which they laboured.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON opposed the Amendment, on the ground that the cleansing and disinfection of trucks had been obligatory on railway companies under various Acts of Parliament ever since the Cattle Plague Orders of 1867. An attempt, moreover, on the part of the company with which the noble Marquess was connected to impose a charge on its customers had been pronounced illegal, Mr. Justice Keating holding that it was not a service rendered to the plaintiff individually as distinguished from the rest of the public, and Justices Montague Smith and Brett concurred with him. On the ground stated by the learned Judge the existing law ought to be maintained.

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendments made; Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 236.)

REPORT.

Amendment *reported* (according to Order).

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 12, after ("engine") insert ("Provided always, that where the Court of Queen's Bench shall on appeal from the decision of the said commissioners or inspectors have decided that any such fixed engine is legal, the said inspectors shall give a certificate to that effect to the person entitled thereto.")—(*The Lord Dufferin.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill to be read 3^a on *Thursday* next.

DUBLIN FREEMEN COMMISSION BILL.

(*The Lord Lurgan.*)

(NO. 210.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Lord Lurgan.*)

THE EARL OF LONGFORD urged that, considering the slender and accidental majority of 1 last night in favour of proceeding with the measure, it was scarcely reasonable that the Government should persevere with it. They had no doubt introduced it in the belief that it was for the public interest; but, instead of being a statesmanlike endeavour to remedy an abuse, it was really a party proceeding, and the persecution of a political interest. He moved that the Bill be committed this day three months.

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months.")—(*The Earl of Longford.*)

EARL GRANVILLE hoped the opposition would not be pressed, the question having been decided last night on two separate divisions, and no notice having been given of the Amendment. He denied that any party question was involved in the Bill.

LORD CAIRNS said, he thought the merits of the Bill were fairly challenged last night. The majority was not a very large one; but at this period of the Session it would hardly be right to divide again on the same question, and he hoped his noble Friend would not persevere with his Amendment, particularly as no notice had been given of it.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.* House in Committee accordingly; Bill *reported* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL—(No 251.)

(*The Lord Northbrook.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD NORTHBROOK, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, stated that the original estimate of the works was over £10,000,000; that a subsequent estimate was £7,470,000; that a loan of £6,000,000 had been authorized, the greater portion of which had been expended; and that the Bill authorized a further loan of £1,500,000, which it was believed would bring the works to completion. The estimate of 1867 would not be exceeded—indeed, the present estimate showed a reduction of a few thousand pounds. Last year, in consequence of a discussion in the House of Commons, Sir John Pakington, then Secretary for War, appointed a Committee of highly competent men to inquire into the condition of the works, and their Report gave a very high opinion of their construction, of the carefulness of the estimates, and generally of the designs. They recommended some modifications, which had been submitted to the Defence and Fortifications Committee, comprising His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief and eminent officers. One of them was that in consequence of the introduction of Captain Moncrieff's gun carriage the guns so mounted would not require the expensive iron shields otherwise necessary, and this would effect a considerable saving.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT BILL.

[NO. 249.] SECOND READING.

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that by the Act of 1867 the Parliamentary deposit of any company was made liable to its debts in the event of its being wound up. Schemes were sometimes got up without any expectation of fulfilment, and the solicitors and others who promoted them not unfrequently incurred considerable expenses, which were at present paid out of the Parliamentary deposits. Now, it was very desirable that, in the case of schemes of an illusory nature, the promoters should be prevented from obtaining repayment of their costs out of the Parliamentary deposit. It did not appear that the Board of Trade was the proper tribunal for determining whether the scheme was or was not of an illusory character, and this question would be decided by a court of law. The Bill, therefore, empowered a court of law to decide whether the promoters should receive their expenses out of the Parliamentary deposit until all the other creditors had been satisfied.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

NATIONAL GALLERY.—RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF WINCHILSEA said, that he had asked a few days ago a Question concerning certain pictures in the National Gallery, but had received an answer which he thought far from satisfactory. The noble Lord who then answered on the part of the Trustees of the National Gallery (Lord Overstone) did not, as he expected, offer any evidence of the genuineness of the pictures then referred to. He had been very much surprised at the statement made by the noble Lord with respect to the power of the Director in purchasing pictures; but having since looked into the Treasury Minute he was bound to say that the noble Lord was perfectly correct in his statement. At the same time a more extraordinary Minute he never saw in his life. From the Minute it seemed that the Trustees had a mere barren power, and all the real power was placed in the Director. It appeared that in the case of the purchase of pictures the whole power of the Trustees was confined to a barren protest, and that pictures were bought upon the judgment of the Director alone, whose decision, upon all the suggestions made to him, would be final. According to the

Treasury Minute, one of the most important of the duties of the Director was to construct the history of every picture in the collection. In this way the history of one of these pictures had been constructed, no evidence of its genuineness being offered, though opinions were referred to in its favour. Reference was made to Vasari, who was represented to have said that Michael Angelo left many unfinished works in painting. Now, this was a complete misrepresentation of the passage in Vasari, who said that they were finished works. He contended that, for the satisfaction of the Director himself, and certainly for that of the public, it would be better that those who had the power of altering the Treasury Minute should alter it in the terms of the Motion of which he had given notice. What he proposed was—

> "That henceforth it be an instruction to Mr. Boxall, R.A., to buy no picture in England without previously submitting it to the judgment of the Trustees of the National Gallery, or any picture in foreign parts which has not got an authentic pedigree from the date of its being painted by the Master to whom it is ascribed to the day of purchase, unless by special permission in writing from the aforesaid Trustees."

Now, he did not think that was at all an unreasonable restriction. The country in no way stinted the National Gallery in the grant of money for the purchase of pictures; and in return he submitted that the country had a right to require genuine works of art, and not works about which there was a great variety of opinion. The variety of opinions respecting the supposed Rembrandt was so great that it should be put, with the spurious "Ecce Homo," in the cellar of the National Gallery. That would be the best place for it, because to see this picture attributed to Rembrandt surrounded by undoubted Rembrandts was too much for a person who had formed a correct notion of art. He hoped he should not be understood as saying anything offensive to Mr. Boxall personally. He had not the honour of that gentleman's acquaintance, and it was only on public grounds that he brought forward this question. He should not trouble their Lordships to divide on his Motion; but having directed attention to the subject, which he thought was really of vital importance, he hoped that something might be done to insure for the future that the public, in return for their money, should have pictures about the authenticity of which there could be no doubt.

Moved to resolve, That henceforth it be an instruction to Mr. Boxall, R.A., to buy no picture in England without previously submitting it to the judgment of the Trustees of the National Gallery, or any picture in foreign parts which has not got an authentic pedigree from the date of its being painted by the master to whom it is ascribed to the day of purchase, unless by special permission in writing from the aforesaid Trustees.—(*The Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.*)

Earl GRANVILLE said, he did not question that his noble Friend had directed attention to this subject upon public grounds, nor did he venture to impugn the correctness of his taste, knowing the attention he had paid to art subjects. But as to the authenticity of these pictures, he thought he had hardly ever heard a more complete answer than that given the other evening by the noble Lord (Lord Overstone), who, he regretted to say, was not now present, and who was conversant with all the details connected with these pictures. With regard to the mere business question of where the responsibility should rest in these cases, he entirely disagreed from his noble Friend. In his opinion it was of great importance that one paid officer—an officer paid by Parliament — should be made responsible for every purchase. If he did that which the Trustees thought he ought not to do, they could protest against the purchase. But there was no mistake so great as to invest with responsibility a considerable number of persons, sometimes attending, sometimes not attending, and all occupied with other matters. The real mode of insuring effective responsibility was to declare that whatever was done should be done by one paid officer responsible to Parliament and to public opinion. Holding this opinion, he could not encourage his noble Friend in the hope that the Government would be inclined to make the change which he proposed.

Motion, (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 3rd August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Antrim, *v.* Rear Admiral George Henry Seymour, C.B., deceased.

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Benefit Building Societies Regulation *.

Ordered — First Reading — Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration * [260]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) * [261].

First Reading—Millbank Prison * [258]; Straits Settlements * [259].

Committee—East India Loan * [251]—R.P.; Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [215] —R.P.

Committee—Report—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c. * [201]; East India Loan * [251]; Harbour of Galle Loan * [250]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * [244]; Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [221].

Considered as amended — Dividends on Public Stocks * [247]; Inclosure of Lands * [31].

Third Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [238], *debate adjourned;* Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment * [227], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Inclosure of Lands (No. 2) * [148]; Offices Abolition * [246].

The House met at Two of the clock.

INFANTICIDE.—QUESTION.

Mr. RAIKES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce any measure, during next Session, with the object of enabling juries to convict persons guilty of infanticide, without exposing them to the sentence of death now necessarily pronounced, but never carried out in such cases?

Mr. BRUCE: Sir, I am unable to give any pledge on this subject, more especially as I am in doubt, as at present advised, whether it would be proper to consider infanticide apart from the general question of murder.

COURTS OF JUSTICE—CAREY STREET SITE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MONK said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed forthwith with the erection of the New Law Courts on the Carey Street Site, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee?

Mr. GLADSTONE: In answer, Sir, to the Question of my hon. Friend, I have to say that I do not think it possible for the Government to arrive at any positive decision, much less to take any positive step in relation to a document understood to proceed from a Select Committee, but not yet laid before the House, and which, if laid before the House, could not be considered along with the evidence. I am afraid, at this period of the Session, my hon. Friend's Question is premature.

Mr. MONK said, he would like to know from the Secretary of the Treasury when the Report would be in the hands of Members?

Mr. AYRTON said, he could not say. It rested entirely with the Chairman of a Select Committee to see that his Report was printed accurately.

Mr. MONK said, he had asked the question of the Secretary to the Treasury in the absence of the noble Lord (Lord Stanley) the Member for King's Lynn, who was Chairman of the Select Committee.

SCOTLAND—DISTRIBUTOR OF STAMPS FOR AYRSHIRE.—QUESTION,

Lord GARLIES said, he wished to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Mr. Oswald has resigned his appointment as Distributor of Stamps for the county of Ayrshire; and, if so, whether the appointment has been or is intended to be filled up?

Mr. AYRTON: Sir, it is quite correct that Mr. Oswald has ceased to hold the office of Stamp Distributor for Ayrshire, and arrangements are made for the appointment of another officer to discharge the duties, but on the understanding that the appointment will be subject to further arrangements with a view to economy.

INDIA—TROOPS IN BHOOTAN.

QUESTION.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the troops that served in Bhootan in 1864 and 1865 will receive the medal granted for frontier service in India; and, if not, the reasons for not giving it to them?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, I must repeat to my hon. Friend the Member for

Fife the answer which I gave to my hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) some weeks ago—namely, that the North-west Frontier medal was conferred at the suggestion of the Government of India, but that the Government of India has not recommended the grant of any medal for Bhootan.

UNION OF PARISHES IN WESTMINSTER.

QUESTION.

DR. BREWER said, he wished to ask the President of the Poor Law Board, If, before proceeding to unite the parishes of St. Margaret's and St. John's Westminster, to the parish of St. George Hanover Square, he will cause an investigation to be made into the Workhouse accommodation, the debts on account of Poors Rate, and more especially into the general system of management prevailing in the aforesaid parishes?

MR. GOSCHEN: In reply, Sir, to my hon. Friend, I have to say that I cannot undertake to cause an investigation to be made into the workhouse accommodation in question, because it has already been made. The debts have also been ascertained; they will be discharged by the parishes of St. Margaret's and St. John's, and, of course, no portion of them will fall on the parish of St. George, Hanover Square. It is also unnecessary to inquire into the general system of management prevailing in the aforesaid parishes, because that will be charged on the union of the parishes under the Amalgamation Act, in which amalgamated management very probably my hon. Friend will have a part.

INDIA—PUNJAUB TENANCY ACT.

QUESTION.

MR. C. DENISON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, If he will lay upon the Table the Petition of the Landed Proprietors of the Punjaub against the enforcement of the Punjaub Tenancy Act, together with the Minute of the Lieutenant Governor, Sir D. MacLeod, transmitting the said Petition to the Supreme Government; and, whether he will state the substance of any Resolution thereupon which may have been adopted by the Secretary of State?

MR. GRANT DUFF: Sir, these Papers cannot be laid at present on the Table, as no resolution has yet been taken about them. The whole question is engaging the attention of the Secretary of State.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL—COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton.*)

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. CRAWFORD begged leave to call the attention of the House to an important alteration which had been introduced into one of the clauses of this Bill. In all previous Appropriation Bills there had been a power of borrowing on the part of the Government, but that power had been somewhat restricted. The power hitherto was expressed thus—"The Governor and Company of the Bank of England shall have power to lend to the Government." He believed that these words were in the draft of the Bill as it originally stood; but it had since been altered, and they now ran in this way—"The Commissioners of the Treasury may borrow on the credit of the same"—or, in other words, that the Commissioners of the Treasury should have a general borrowing power conferred upon them. Now, he had no objection to such a borrowing power; but this was a very important alteration, and he thought attention should be called to it, giving, as it did, great latitude to the Treasury. He conceived the Treasury was quite justified in obtaining for the service of the State such advances of money as might be required from any quarter they might think fit; and he wished the House clearly to understand that it was not at all in consequence of his connection with the Bank of England that he raised any objection to this change in the borrowing powers conferred on the Government. His only wish was that attention might be drawn to the fact, and that the people out-of-doors might know that this great change had been made in the borrowing powers of the Government. The only further observation by way of criticism he should like to make on the matter was this—that the change was of that important character that he thought the attention of the House ought to have been called to it by some one of those having charge of the Bill, and it should not have been left to any private Member to draw attention to the subject. He wished distinctly to repeat, standing there as the representative of the Bank of England, that no jealousy was felt at the enlargement of the powers of the Government, and he only made these observations on the subject because he thought it right that the people out-of-doors should be informed of the fact of the change which had been made. He was quite aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had pointed to a change of this kind on introducing his Budget; but the language of the right hon. Gentleman had hardly justified the expectation that his intention would so soon be carried into effect.

House *resumed;* Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

MR. GRANT DUFF *: The House has just resolved itself into Committee, for the purpose of discharging, what I may be permitted to call, not the least important of the many duties which are discharged by the most powerful and most hard-worked Assembly which exists, or ever has existed, in the world. It has resolved itself into Committee for the purpose of hearing the annual statement which it requires with regard to the affairs of its great vassal Empire in Asia—an Empire covering as large a portion of the earth's surface as France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, North Germany, South Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Denmark, Scandinavia, Turkey, and Greece, all put together, and inhabited by men at least as various as those who inhabit all these countries, but of whom some 147,000,000 are our fellow-subjects, just as much as the inhabitants of Yorkshire or of Kent, and another 50,000,000, although not precisely our fellow-subjects, are amenable to our influence in a far greater degree than any of our neighbours in this quarter of the globe. Nothing gives a more striking idea of the ease—or ought I to say the heedlessness?—with which this great nation still, in spite of the poet, sustains "the too vast orb of its fate," than the fact that it so seldom takes the trouble to investigate, through this House, which is the reflection or concentration of itself, the progress of its affairs in the East, giving its confidence thoroughly to those who represent it here and in India, and only asking an account of their proceedings at distant intervals. If the effect of this were that our affairs were neglected, and that our Empire were slipping from us, such conduct might be properly represented as a base dereliction of duty; but if our affairs are going from better to better, then perhaps it is only a sign that the instinct which taught us how to acquire, till teaches us how to keep our wonderful possession. The phrase Indian Budget, usually applied to the business which comes before us to-night, is a misleading one. We have to deal with something less and something more than a budget. Our position is a very different one from that which we occupied on the 8th of April last. Then we were considering matters directly bearing upon our own pockets and purses. Now we are going to consider matters whose direct bearing is on the pockets and purses of men separated from us by many thousands of miles, and by still wider gulfs than any that are made by mere distance. Even if it were possible for the representative of the Indian Government in this House to invoke the assistance of the fairy Agreeable Surprise, who generally presides over English Budgets, the Committee would hear with comparatively languid satisfaction that such and such taxes, which neither they nor their constituents pay, can be dispensed with. But that fairy cannot possibly be invoked; for those hon. Members who take most interest in the affairs of India, know pretty well the main features of the statement which I shall have to present to them. I cannot accordingly indulge, as my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer did on a recent occasion, in the pleasure so natural to a benevolent mind, of shaking my hearers over the pit of financial ruin, or of letting them drop into it, and catching them half-way down. That pleasure, I say, is denied to the mouthpiece of the Indian Government; but as some compensation he is always encouraged by the Committee, and is, indeed, obliged by the necessity of the case, to enter into somewhat wider considerations than the English Chancellor of the Exchequer is permitted to do. For the India Office is not a great Department, like the Treasury. It is the whole controlling government of an Empire, with its own Treasury and its own War Office, dealing with interests, not so large, indeed, as those with which the English Departments deal, but larger than those which are managed by the corresponding Departments at Vienna or Berlin.

The necessity for compressing an enormous mass of matter into a small space must make the statement which I have to lay before the Committee to-day drier than I could wish; but I shall do my best to eliminate from it all facts which are incapable of being retained in the mind of the hearer. My business, as I understand it, is to give such an exposition of the finances of India as may make pretty clear to all who listen to me, what is the actual position of that country at this moment; how it has been getting on since the 31st March, 1867, and how it seems likely to get on up to the 31st March, 1870. The Committee will see that I mean to devide my statement in the usual way, into three parts. I mean to explain the actual completed accounts for the year ending on the 31st March, 1868; to tell hon. Members, as well as I can, how the accounts of the year, ending on the 31st of March, 1869, of which we have not yet seen the whole, are likely to turn out, and to make the best predictions which our information enables me to make about the year which will end on the 31st March, 1870. In technical language, I will deal first with Actuals; secondly, with the Regular Estimate; thirdly, with the Budget Estimate. First, then, for the Actuals; that is, for the year which began on the 1st of April, 1867, and ended on the 31st of March, 1868. In that year the gross amount of our receipts was £48,534,412. That is to say, we had not so large an income as the United States, as France, as England, or as Russia; but we had a larger income than any nation except these four. Now, from what sources did this enormous income come to us? Much the largest item of our Indian Revenue is the sum which we derive from our assessments on the land. This amounted in the year ending March 31, 1868, in round numbers, to £20,000,000 (£19,986,640). This source of income is sometimes described as a rent, but that description is not altogether an accurate one; for, as is well said in the despatch by which the Court of Directors replied to a remarkable Minute of Lord Harris's in 1856—

> "The officers engaged in the duty of fixing the assessment should always bear in mind that, as you have expressed it, the right of the Government is not a rent which consists of all the surplus produce, after paying the costs of cultivation and the profits of the agricultural stocks, but a land revenue only, which ought, if possible, to be so lightly assessed as to leave a surplus or rent to the occupier, whether he, in fact, let the land to others or retain it in his own hands."

The spirit which animates these lines is that which has guided the Indian Government of late years. The tendency has been to diminish assessments—not to increase them—in ether words, to let the people, as we say in Scotland, "sit easy." In 1862, it appeared that the then rulers, forced to take action by a Resolution of Lord Canning and his Council, in the autumn of the previous year, had made up their minds that the old Indian land revenue had not the virtue in it which used to be believed, and that the *summum bonum* of the financier was to be found in a wealthy people, able to buy large quantities of taxable articles, and to endure all the various financial tortures which modern ingenuity has divised for the *contribuable* of Europe. And so a despatch went forth from the India Office on the 9th of July, 1862, decreeing the establishment of a judicious permanent settlement. A few days afterwards, Mr. Vansittart moved for certain dissents which had been recorded by Members of Council. The result was the laying before Parliament of two most excellent Papers — one by Mr. Mangles, advocating the old land revenue arrangements, the other by Sir John Lawrence advocating a permanent settlement. No one can read these Papers without being greatly impressed by both of them, but the side which he will take will depend rather upon his general views with regard to taxation, than upon his special views with regard to India. Far be it from me to say to which opinion I incline when such great doctors disagreee; but the outcome of the controversy, looking at the matter purely historically, has been a strange one, for the *victrix causa* has, it would seem, pleased the gods as little as it pleased Cato, and the old system of moderate assessments, liable to be revised at the end of long periods, still goes on. The permanent settlement which was contemplated has never been carried out. We are now, with regard to our land revenue, very much in the position of a gentleman who has property in various parts of the British Isles, where different customs prevail with respect to the granting and length of leases. In the North-west Provinces, for instance, no increase is to be looked for till the end of the century, for we are just commencing a new period of settlement or lease for thirty years. In Madras, on the other hand, where the settlement is made on totally different principles, we may look for a slow and steady increase. In Bombay, we may look for an increase which will be steady and not slow; and so I might go on through most of the provinces of India, showing that we and our descendants may expect a large rise of revenue from the land throughout the greater part of British India. Tributes and contributions from Native States form the second item of our revenue, and bring in not much less than £700,000 (£689,286). To explain how that aggregate has accrued to us would be to recount a very large part of Indian history during the last 200 years. The amount is not great; less than would be brought in to the English Exchequer by a halfpenny income tax at home. Of old, however, tribute has been the distinguishing mark of rule, and he must be strangely constituted who does not reflect, with a certain satisfaction, that amongst those whose offerings swell this sum are men who may vie in the splendour of their lineage with the oldest European Sovereigns, and more than one who could, with no offence to truth, make prouder answers than even that which Prince Massimo made to the First Napoleon, when he was asked if he was descended from Fabius Maximus—"I cannot prove it; but it is a story that has been repeated for 1,000 years in my family." Our forests yielded about £330,000 (£331,088), a much smaller amount than they would have yielded if we had begun to attend carefully to them when we first grew strong in India. That, however, was not to have been expected. Forests always seem inexhaustible until they begin to be exhausted. When history comes to number up the good deeds which Britain has done for India, she will not, I am sure, forget to record amongst them that—not an hour to soon, indeed, but yet not too late—she called in European science to check the destruction of the forests. No one who has not looked into this subject has the faintest idea how terrible have been the effects, over wide regions of the globe, of carelessness in keeping up a proper proportion of trees. Let any one to whom this whole subject is new turn to the remarkable work of the American Minister at Florence, Mr. Marsh, upon *Physical Geography as modified by Human Action*, and he will shudder at the dangers which we have only just escaped. If our predecessors had known what we know, much of the enormous expense that we are now being put to with regard to irrigation would have been quite unnecessary. But the mistakes of former days are past praying for, and we can now only rejoice that free course has been given to Dr. Brandis and his subordinates; that the saving of the forest has been recognized as a great State necessity; that a regular Forest Department has been inaugurated, which will take to India the science of France and Germany, and that the good example of forest conservation set in British territory is beginning to spread into some of the Native States. The forest revenue is derived chiefly from the sale of timber, but also from a system of seignorage or license to cut, which will, however, disappear when the amended arrangements for forest organization are complete. In Burmah, something is brought in by a duty levied on the wood floated down the great rivers from non-British territory. Something, too, is gained in many places by miscellaneous products, such as honey, bees' wax, and lac. I have no doubt that when science has been more systematically applied in various places to the investigation of the resources of India, a great many small gains of this kind will be realized, all tending to make heavy the coffers of the State, and to ease the burden of the taxpayer. With a view to this, among other good results, the preparation of a *Flora Sylvatica* for the Punjaub and the North-western Provinces has just been sanctioned. A large project for taking stock of the natural products of India is likewise in contemplation, and the preparation of a *Guide to the Indian Forester* is proposed. In time we shall, no doubt, have a special college for forest science in India, like that for teaching engineering, which already exists at Roorkee. There are few sources of revenue the increase of which it is more agreeable to contemplate than this; and, although the rise will be gradual, because we have a great deal still to do, and much to expend before we can reap the full results of good and economic forest management, it will ultimately be very large. The next head is Excise on Spirits and Drugs, or, as it is sometimes called, the Abkari revenue. From this source we derived nearly £2,250,000 (£2,238,931). The articles which contributed to swell this large amount were many and various. There were spirits distilled by native methods from several palms—as the cocoa-nut, the date, and the palmyra. There were spirits made from the young leaf-stalk of the cashew, as well as from the fruit of the mangoe. There were spirits distilled by English methods from rice and sugar, and there were the many preparations of opium and of hemp, which, to a great extent, take the place in India of the alcoholic stimulants familiar to more northern climes, happily without producing quite such bad effects, although, no doubt, mischievous enough. The next head is the Certificate Tax, which gives us more than £650,000 (£653,848). This impost was introduced in 1867, by Mr. Massey, under the name of a license tax, but was somewhat altered in 1868, and changed its title. It amounted to a kind of graduated income tax, upon persons engaged in trades and professions; but as it has now, in the year 1869-70, merged in a different tax, of which I shall have to speak presently, I need not dwell further upon it. The Customs gave us upwards of £2,500,000 (£2,578,632). They are derived partly from export and partly from import duties. The schedule of the first of these is very short, and contains only indigo, grain, lac, oils, seeds, shawls, cotton goods, hides or skins, and spices. The list of import duties is longer, still comprising sixty-five principal heads of taxed articles. Before 1867 they were far more numerous. The rates are low, 7½ per cent *ad valorem*, being the usual duty. Some classes of goods are exceptionally favoured—thus cotton twist pays only 3½ per cent; cotton, flax, silk, and woollen piece-goods only 5 per cent. It will be seen that our Indian tariff contrasts favourably with most others, though I confess that, speaking only for myself, and by no means committing anyone else, I trust the hour may one day arrive when we shall be enabled still further to reduce, not to say to extinguish, it altogether. The next head of revenue is that of Salt, from which we derived more than £5,700,000 (£5,726,093). The days are long gone by when this tax could fairly be represented as an extremely oppressive one. Nevertheless, there are large districts of the country, more especially the Punjaub, the North-west Provinces, Central Provinces, and Oude, in which a very great deal is to be said for a reduction of duty, and in some parts of which the existing state of things is, at the least, highly inconvenient. This salt question has occupied, during the last year, much time, both in India and at the India Office, and I trust that before very long some improvements may be inaugurated. We are certainly very far from having yet arrived at the *dernier mot* of politico-economical wisdom in dealing with this matter. From salt, the third largest feeder of our revenue, I pass to Opium, the second largest, from which we received in 1867-8 nearly £9,000,000 (£8,923,568). Our opium revenue is derived from two sources — first, from the opium which is grown under our own superintendence, and prepared for exportation at Patna, in Bengal, and at Gazeepore in the North-west Provinces, after which it is sold by public auction for Government account; and, secondly, from a transit duty levied on the opium grown in the States of Central India, and shipped at Bombay. No one who occupies himself with Indian finance can be altogether happy about this revenue. I do not speak of its moral aspect; that is a large and interesting subject, on which I cannot enter now. When I speak of our opium revenue as a weak point, I am thinking only of its financial aspect. It is exposed, it seems to me, to three dangers—first, to the possibility of some movement in China which may effectually close that market; secondly, to an effective competition in the Chinese markets from other countries; and, thirdly, to such an improvement in the manufacture of opium in China itself, as to make it independent of the Indian supply. The first of these dangers is not an imaginary one; for we know that hostility to the poppy was one of the many strange characteristics of that terrible rebellion misnamed the Great Peace, which lately desolated so many cities in the Flowery Land, and added by its results one more irony to history. Nevertheless I cannot believe that any movement of this kind will ever be so general in China—a country which is, be it remembered, equal in size to eighteen Great Britains—as to lead to anything like an entire cessation of our traffic. Nay, rather, I expect that increased communication with Western China will favour it. As to the second danger, the increase of competition from other countries, especially Persia, some persons think it the gravest of the three; but it has not yet been proved that the supply is likely to increase very much. As to the third danger, the best authorities tell us that although the poppy is very largely grown in some parts of China, for instance in the great province of Szechuen, the Chinese drug cannot compete with the Indian, which stands to it in the relation of the Havanna cigar to ordinary European produce. At the same time, no one can venture to say that this superiority will always continue. Stamps gave us nearly £2,200,000 (£2,186,269). These do not differ materially in general character from those with which we are familiar at home. Up to the days of Mr. Wilson, the use of stamps in India had been confined to proceedings in the courts, but by him they were extended to bills of exchange, receipts, agreements, and other papers. Some persons expect a great deal of increase under this head of revenue, meeting the argument of the possible danger of a denial of justice, resulting from the operation of the stamp law, by pointing to the intense litigiousness so common in India, which they would fain check, lest our tribunals be altogether broken down—and no doubt the stamp revenue has grown enormously, having trebled itself since 1859-60; but it is a financial expedient, the operation of which seems to me eminently to require watching, and on which it would be easy to build too high hopes. The Mint yielded £120,000 (£120,252). The Post Office £660,000 (£659,670)—not a large sum; but then it should be remembered that within the limits of India our post is one of the cheapest in the world. From Cape Comorin to Peshawur in the far North-west, from Peshawur to Sudyah in Assam, whence a few days' march takes the traveller into China, the charge is uniform, and the service is generally performed with fair regularity, though the Government of India very justly conceives that it can be still further improved, and is taking measures to import the last European methods. It is, perhaps, worth considering whether we should not increase our revenue, and do more real good to the population of the Indian Continent, taken as a whole, if we somewhat increased the charge for letters passing over long distances, and very considerably reduced the charge on letters passing over very short distances. A large amount of native correspondence is said to dispense with our postal facilities. The Telegraph gave us about £215,000. Fees of court and similar payments brought us in about £720,000 (£719,342), under the head of Law and Justice; and about £232,000 (£231,972) came in under the head of Police, from fines and payments for services performed. Shore dues, pilotage charges, and the like gave us £455,000 (£455,090). School and College dues, with other small matters, made up a sum of about £74,000 (£73,845), under the head of Education. Interest on Government Securities held in the Currency department, on shares in the Bank of Bengal and Madras, and on advances to the various service funds, brought us about £212,000 (£211,975), and under the three heads of Miscellaneous, Army Miscellaneous, Public Works Miscellaneous, we received the large sum of £2,428,000 (£2,428,103) from sources too numerous to mention, but chiefly from the sale of stores. I have been dealing with round numbers, but the Committee will, I dare say, take it from me, that the amount of all our items of receipt united came to £48,534,412 in the year with which I am occupied, the year of Actuals, the year ending March 31, 1868.

I now come to the other side of the account—to our expenditure. The first item which I would mention is the Interest on our Registered Debt in India, amounting to £62,827,200, for which we paid in the year ending 31st March, 1868, £2,761,000 (£2,761,833). Our home debt was, on 31st March, 1868, £30,697,000, on which we paid £1,452,490, so that we are paying £4 13*s.* 8*d.* per cent on the debt in England and India taken as a whole. In the year 1800 we were paying 8½ per cent upon our debt. That is not a very unsatisfactory state of things—little more than 4½ per cent on a debt equivalent to about twice our gross annual income. I wish our home debt was no worse, and the other great Empires of the world, the United States, France, and Russia, may well wish the same, although our positions are not quite similar. I do not know if the attention of hon. Members interested in India has been called to a short Return which was laid before the House some weeks ago, showing approximately the amount of our registered debt in India held by Europeans and natives respectively. From that it would appear that a good deal more than three times as much of our securities is held by Europeans as by natives, and that a larger amount is held in London, in enfaced paper alone, than is held by natives in all our funds put together. One sometimes hears a good deal of uneasiness expressed at the small amount of the Government securities which are held by natives, and conclusions are drawn unfavourable to the confidence of the native population in the security of the tenure by which we hold India. No doubt it would be desirable to have a far larger number of native holders, and perhaps as time goes on we shall, by savings banks and other devices, succeed in tapping the hoards of the non-mercantile classes. The education of those classes has not, however, yet reached the investing point; and, as for the mercantile classes, why on earth should they invest at under 5 per cent, when they can get perfectly good security at 12 or 18 per cent? Such being the golden opportunities of the Indian investor, we cannot be surprised that those natives who hold our securities largely should be chiefly persons whose families have risen to importance through their connection with the British, and who are, to a certain extent, Europeanized. The second item is Interest on Service Funds and other Accounts, for which we paid more than £800,000 (£824,113). The Military and Bengal and Bombay Medical Service Funds have been taken over by us since the amalgamation, we becoming responsible to the subscribers and annuitants for the amount they would have received if the old arrangements had continued. When the last beneficiary under the funds dies, the whole funds, and a good deal more which we have given as a matter of grace and favour, will have disappeared, the charge will vanish from our account, and the capital which we only administered, so to speak, as trustees, will vanish also. The Civil Service Annuity Fund and the Widows' Funds, also in connection with the Civil Service, still go on, and, so long as they continue, the charge on their account will appear in our expenditure.

Then come the expenses in getting in our revenue, classed under thirteen heads, with which I will not trouble the Committee, because there are only two of these items to which I think it is worth while particularly to allude. These are the Post Office and the Telegraph. The facilities given by the former are, as I have already shown, very great, but the expense is also considerable, and it is steadily increasing. In the year with which we are dealing it cost £490,000 (£491,690). The Telegraph cost £396,000 (£396,517), being more than it brought in; but, considering the peculiar conditions under which the service is carried out, this is not surprising. We send messages of ten words from one end of India to the other for 2*s.* Law and Justice cost £2,500,000 (£2,544,349), a sum whose relative if not absolute amount may be perhaps diminished, if it is found, as I hope it may be, that we can substitute, to a considerable extent, in the judicial department, cheap native for high-priced European agency. I do not think I need specify the sums which we paid for Marine Charges, Ecclesiastical Charges, Medical Services, Stationery, and Printing; but the Committee may be interested to know that Superannuation, Retired, and Compassionate Allowances in India cost more than £900,000 (£911,256). Administration and Public Departments are set down in our accounts as costing £1,100,000 (£1,124,396); but, of course, a large part of the items which I have described as charges for getting in our revenue, are made up of administration charges. It is a pity that no one has ever succeeded in conveying to the imagination of Englishmen what their countrymen really do in the way of administration in India. When one has realized it, one's first feeling is one of satisfaction that men taken out of the ordinary current of English life, neither superior nor inferior in point of natural ability to the ordinary run of fairly successful professional men at home, should be capable of doing, under the stimulus of early responsibility, such wonderful things; and his second feeling is, that we hardly make sufficient use of the large number of trained administrators who return year by year to our shores. England affords no field for their labours, no field for the exercise of their peculiar aptitudes. If they succeed here, it is by virtue of possessing other aptitudes; but the remarkable administration of Sir John Peter Grant in Jamaica shows that England need never be at a loss when a colony situated like that island has to be rescued, and surely if such things were possible, more than one country might borrow retired Indian Governors to its own great advantage. The next charge which I shall mention, is that for Allowances and Assignments under Treaties and Engagements, about £1,900,000 (£1,873,072), a head of expenditure which was once neatly described in this House as the purchase-money of our position in India. That is a phrase which would require, of course, large qualification to make it square accurately with the facts, but it represents a side of the truth about our position in India which is too often forgotten by persons of the blood-and-iron school. The Indian Diplomatic Service cost £240,000 (£241,801), not a large sum when we remember the vast amount of work that is done for it. It is impossible to keep too continually before us the fact that India was not won, is not held, and never will be held, by force alone. It was won, it is held, and it always will be held, while our Empire lasts, partly by force, but largely, much more largely, by policy. Next to making the people happy within our own territories, there is nothing so important as the maintenance of satisfactory relations with the powers, small and great, scattered up and down through our vast dominions, and that not only with great princes like Scindiah, or, greater still, the Nizam, but with very many others of far inferior importance, who are yet, most of them, a good deal more influential than the observer of Indian politics would, at first sight, suppose. I am happy to say that at present our relations with all the native States is very satisfactory. From this trifling charge for policy, it is melancholy to turn to the frightful drain on our resources which is caused by the sad necessity of being always ready to use the "last argument of kings." The total Army charges in India for the year under consideration amounted to over £12,600,000 (£12,603,467). In England, including costs of stores, they nearly reached the sum of £3,500,000 (£3,499,829). Thus the total Army charges in England and India were £16,100,000 (£16,103,296). Enormous as this sum is, the force which we maintain is not very great. We had, by the last Returns, 64,704 Europeans serving in India, as against 45,522, the number which we had on the 1st day of January in the year of the Mutiny; and we had of native troops 122,984, as against 249,153, whom we had on that same 1st day of January, 1857.

> "There is no country in the world," says Major Chesney, "in which the military force bears so small a proportion to the population. City for city, the military garrisons of India are smaller than even those of England."

The strong point of our system is, that we have an organization by which we could rapidly, in case of war, increase our Army to any extent we desire. Its weakest point is its enormous cost, and to this the attention of the Secretary of State in Council has been lately called. The result has been a despatch to India, which will, I trust, strengthen the hands of economists in that country. Over and above our Army we have a Police Force, which numbered, at the end of 1865, nearly 160,000 men, and cost, in 1867-8, nearly £2,500,000 (£2,434,125.) Fears have been more than once expressed in this House as to whether it was safe to maintain so large a body of armed men alongside of our native troops. The truth would seem to be, that through very large districts of the country the police is in a satisfactory condition, and in no way either dangerous or inefficient, but that in other parts it is susceptible of improvement. The next item to which I will allude is Education, Science, and Art, our civilizing agencies, which, with its £780,000 (£783,510), shows very poorly beside our colossal military outgoings. The purely educational portion of this sum of £780,000 went, for the most part, to the maintenance of Government Schools and Colleges, but some of it also for grants-in-aid, scholarships, payment of inspectors, Government book-depots, &c. We have six classes of schools in India—(1.) Village or Vernacular Schools; (2.) District Schools, where English is taught in the higher classes; (3.) Colleges, where the education is conducted in English; (4.) two Presidency Colleges, each with a faculty of arts and law; (5.) the Engineering and Medical Colleges; (6.) the Normal Schools. In all, we may have about 20,000 schools, or like establishments, with a continually improving network of official inspection. It is a matter for congratulation to those who have had of late years the disposal of Indian patronage, that when the University of Edinburgh was called upon to select a successor to a man so eminent as the late Sir David Brewster, it sent to the other end of the world for the Director of Public Instruction at Bombay. So much for our teaching machinery. Our machinery for testing the success of our higher education consists of three Universities—one at Bombay, one at Madras, and one at Calcutta—all modelled on the University of London, and doing their work extremely well. £780,000 would not be a large sum if the whole of it were spent on education; but out of this inconsiderable amount come innumerable expenses, such as those of our great surveys, the trigonometrical, the topographical, the revenue, and others; so also do the expenses of observatories, museums, scientific and literary institutions, botanical gardens, and other things too numerous to mention. In the Central Provinces, which are about as big as the British Isles, surveys and museums seem to have cost, in the year of which I am speaking, the magnificent sum of £35. This is, however, the day of small things in all these matters, and I heartily hope that this item of Indian expenditure will steadily increase, because money expended on education and civilization will, to take the lowest view, soon pay us cent per cent. Under the head Miscellaneous come expenses which defy classification; such as rewards for the destruction of wild beasts, charitable donations, cotton experiments, with much else. Under this head, too, are classed famine relief charges, which, in Bengal, amounted to no less than £227,826, that is, to rather more than a third of the total amount which stands under the head of Miscellaneous in India—over £670,000 (£672,992).

I come now to the last item of our ordinary expenditure in India, the largest of all except our Army expenditure, that, namely, for Public Works Ordinary, for which we paid in India, in the year with which I am dealing, no less than £5,800,000 (£5,800,269). There are two reproaches often brought against Indian administration which effectually neutralize each other. The one is, that enough is not done to improve the magnificent estate which we possess in the East; and the other is, that India lives quite up to her income, and is always borrowing a little. The position, however, of the Indian Government is precisely the position of a country gentleman who, with a moderate immediate income, has a large and very improvable property, on which it is distinctly right for him to make improvement of two kinds, improvements which, I suppose, the country gentleman would class in his accounts as improvements not bearing interest, and improvements bearing interest. The first of these are what we call in India "Public Works Ordinary," and the second are what we call "Public Works Extraordinary." Under the first of these heads the country gentleman would class cottages, roads, and other improvements which he made for the general benefit of his estate, but not as directly and immediately remunerative. And we class under it in India precisely the same kind of things—as roads, improved barracks for our troops, and, in short, all ameliorations which will improve our general position, but will not give direct, obvious, palpable returns for our money. Till recently it has not been the custom of financiers in India to draw a sufficiently broad line between these two very different kinds of expenditure; but a peremptory order was sent out by my right hon. Friend opposite, directing that henceforward only irrigation works, State railways, and what are known as the Special Fund works of Bombay, shall be considered as Extraordinary.

The Committee is aware that new barracks are now being constructed all over India on a magnificent scale. Some persons wish us to treat these as the fortifications of this country were treated by the Government of Lord Palmerston, urging that the saving of European life which they will bring about will diminish our military expenditure, and that they will be possessions for ever, as useful for posterity as for ourselves. We are not so sanguine. We feel that, although it is right to provide the best accommodation for our troops that the science of the day can give, we have by no means arrived at final results, good for all time, with respect to the method of housing our troops; and that, although the huge buildings which are now rising, in deference to public opinion, under the combined advice of benevolence and science, are an improvement upon much that preceded them, they may yet be very far from fulfilling the conditions which the same authority may prescribe to the Indian Governors of the future. Again, even if these barracks could be considered the last expression of sanitary science in stone and lime, posterity, if it has not barracks to build, will, assuredly, have plenty of other things to build. We need only see how our expenditure, both on improvements bearing interest and improvements not bearing interest, has increased in our own time, and to listen to the loud voices, which even now accuse us of sluggishness, to be very sure of that. Common roads, again, we think, should be paid for out of income. The reason of this is, that while we can see some end, though a far-off end, to the making of railways in India, the making of roads will be endless; and to throw the charge for them upon capital would be wildly improvident. A great deal has been already spent upon making roads in the last quarter-of-a-century, since a sudden impulse was given to this form of improvement, first by Mr. Thomason in the North-west Provinces, and then under the orders of Lord Dalhousie in the Punjaub. Still, so enormous is the country with which we are dealing—as large, the Committee will keep in mind, as Europe without Russia—that we have hardly done more than make a commencement, although we are already constructing at the rate of about 8,000 miles of good road in every ten years—each mile of good road costing, according to Major Chesney, £1,000 to make, and £75 a year to keep up. What are 8,000 miles of road, however, in a country like India? After all it only means, supposing it were distributed equally, eighty miles of good road a year in each of the ten provinces; eighty miles in Oude, which is as big as Holland and Belgium; eighty miles in the Punjaub, which is as big as the kingdom of Italy; nay, eighty miles in Bengal, which is very much bigger than France. If we were once to begin borrowing for roads we should borrow to the crack of doom. Looking through the items for Public Works Ordinary, I confess it seems to me that the amount spent is greater than it ought to be, and I hope that, although it might be bad economy suddenly to stop plans in progress, greater caution may be used in future before new schemes are entered upon. Another part of the Public Works Ordinary expenditure requires a word of explanation, loss by exchange on railway transactions—£101,877. This loss arises in the following way:—When the arrangements with the Indian railway companies were made, it was provided that for every rupee they paid in in India from their traffic receipts, they should be credited with 1*s.* 10*d.* in London, and for every 1*s.* 10*d.* they paid in in London to our account at the Bank of England, that is, for every 1*s.* 10*d.* of capital they raised, they should be credited with a rupee in India. A rupee is, however, at the usual rate of exchange, worth 2*s.*, and not 1*s.* 10*d.*, and all accounts between the Indian Office and the Indian Governments are settled at that figure. It follows, therefore, that the companies lose 2*d.* on every rupee they pay in in India, and gain 2*d.* on every 1*s.* 10*d.* they pay in in England, and that as the one-and-tenpences they pay in in England are more numerous than the rupees they pay in in India, they gain and we lose a great deal in the course of the year. Ere long, however, I am happy to say, that the tables will be turned; they will pay in more rupees in India than one-and-tenpences here, and we, not they, will begin to be the winners in the game of exchange.

I have now exhausted our ordinary expenditure in India. It remains to say a very few words on that portion of our expenditure which, as a matter of convenience, is disbursed at home, but over nearly all of which the Home Government has, in the nature of things, only the same general control that it has over the expenditure in India itself. First came the Charges on account of our Home Debt and of some other debt paid at home, for which we paid in 1867-8, £1,516,841, to which must be added £629,970, the Dividends on the Capital Stock of the East India Company. Over these charges we have, of course, no control. Then came the charge for the guaranteed Interest on Railway Capital, less net traffic receipts. That cost more than £1,500,000. Next followed Stores, which cost £970,000, and some other items of the same nature which I need not mention. The Committee will understand that the authorities in India indent on us for everything they want from home. We collect most of the manufactured goods which they require in that large building which stands on the south side of the river between the railway bridge at Charing Cross and Westminster Bridge, examine the articles carefully, pack them, and send them off; other things go direct. From time to time we consider the indents too large, and remonstrate; but, on the whole, the check over expenditure of this kind must be exercised by the good sense of those who order, not by the agents who execute the orders. Our business is rather to see that the Indian Government gets its money's worth for its money, and I must say I think the indents of India might often with advantage be reduced. Then came an item over which we have more control—the Secretary of State's Office and its dependencies, the great India Stores of which I have just been speaking; and, in short, the whole machinery of Indian government in this country. That cost about £193,000 (£193,141). We subscribe £35,000 a year to aid the Imperial Government to keep up a Mission at the Court of Persia, and Consular and Diplomatic Establishments in China. Our Army expenses at home I have already stated. As with revenue so with expenditure, I have been using throughout round numbers, but the Committee will, I dare say, take it from me, that the exact amount of the whole expenditure that I have been tracing comes to £49,542,107, chargeable against our income for the year ending 31st of March, 1868.

So much then for our ordinary expenditure. We are not done, however, with our outgoings for 1867-8, for we spent £219,255 for irrigation works, £382,613 for Special Fund works, as they are called, and £594 in preliminary expenses in connection with railway operations to be undertaken by the State; £602,462 in all. About irrigation works and about State railways I shall have to speak presently. I must first, however, say a word about the Special Fund works, for this phrase, which occurs so often of late years in the Indian accounts, certainly requires explanation. Some time ago the Government of Bombay determined to pull down the ramparts of that city, which were considered useless for modern purposes, to sell the land on which they were built, and to apply the proceeds to the construction of new and more available defences, as well as of a new post office, new court houses, recreation grounds, roads, and a great many other good things. If Bombay had continued prosperous, I think it is probable that all this could have been carried out without making any demand for assistance from the Imperial funds of India. But the crash came—the land cleared of the ramparts, which was expected to fetch immense prices, became temporarily unsaleable, except at a ruinous sacrifice, and Bombay had to approach the Government of India as a suppliant, and to ask for assistance to carry on its works, until the tide of prosperity began to flow again. The Government of India agreed to assist it, and the result is this frequently recurring expenditure for Special Fund works at Bombay, which, if the Government of India holds perfectly good security for the re-payment of its advances, both principal and interest is, quite rightly, not charged against annual income. The accounts, then, of the year ending 31st of March, 1868, when balanced, show a deficit, proving that £1,007,695 have been expended over and above what has been received, irrespective of an amount of about £600,000 which has been sunk in directly reproductive works, and which may be considered simply as capital invested. In round numbers, then, India was, in the year 1867-8, just about £1,000,000 to the bad.

I come now to what is called the Regular Estimate, by which not very appropriate term is designated the estimate of our receipts and expenditure for the year intervening between the close of the year of which we possess the actual accounts, and the commencement of the year with regard to which all is calculation or conjecture. In this case, of course, the year of the Regular Estimate is the year which began on the 1st of April, 1868, and ended on the 31st of March, 1869. In March of this year, 1869, the Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Richard Temple) expected to receive about £750,000 more during the year of the Regular Estimate than Mr. Massey anticipated in March, 1868, from the year of the Regular Estimate, and expected to pay, in round numbers, for the ordinary expenditure of the year, £3,750,000 more than Mr. Massey anticipated having to pay in that year. £3,750,000 of extra expenditure is somewhat startling, but I hasten to explain that £1,750,000 of it arise simply from a change of account. Mr. Massey having charged £1,750,000 for barracks and like works to extraordinary expenditure, or, as we should say in our own private accounts, to capital, and Sir Richard Temple, under the orders to which I have already alluded from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, being most properly, as I think, obliged to charge the same to ordinary expenditure. It remains then to account for the increase of £2,000,000 anticipated by Sir Richard Temple. That arose—first, from an unexpected additional outlay on central jails; secondly, from the fact that the amount of traffic receipts paid over by the guaranteed railway companies to us, in diminution of the interest we pay to their shareholders, has been less than we anticipated; thirdly, from a largely increased expenditure in England, including stores sent out to India from this country, on the requisition of the authorities there—an increase which we observed during the progress of the year, and thought so formidable that we were obliged to call the attention of the Government of India to it by a special despatch; fourthly and lastly, from famine relief works. The year 1868 was, as we all remember, a very exceptional year in Europe so far as the weather was concerned. It was also a very exceptional year in India, and towards its close the greatest possible alarm was excited about the condition of Behar, of the North-west Provinces, of the whole of the native States in Rajpootana, and of all the British districts bordering upon them. It was not only a famine of grain, but a famine of water. The cattle, so indispensable to the native cultivator, died by thousands, and great populations pouring out of the most afflicted territories, such as Marwar, overflowed into our provinces. The great calamity of Orissa had, however, produced its effect. Immense efforts were made alike by the local and by the central authorities; and before Christmas it was pretty clear that, although there might be terrible distress, there would, in purely British possessions, be no famine. Just, however, at the most critical moment, telegrams reached London to say that copious and far-extending falls of rain had suddenly come to the rescue, so that the spring crops have been saved in extensive regions, where, before this fortunate event, there was no hope. Still, however, the failure of last year's crop has pressed with terrible severity upon many thousands of people, and not only does it show its effects in diminishing the expected receipts, and increasing the expected expenditure of the year with which I am dealing — the year of the Regular Estimate—but it throws something of a shadow over the year of which I am presently going to speak—the year of calculation and conjecture. The general result of the somewhat increased receipts and the much increased expenditure, as it seemed to Sir Richard Temple, in the month of March last, was that the ordinary expenditure of the year of the Regular Estimate will be about £1,000,000 more than the receipts. In short, he conceived that there would be a deficit of about £1,000,000. Such were substantially the prospects of the year of the Regular Estimate — for the year, that is, ending 31st March, 1869, when Sir Richard Temple made his statement in Calcutta in the month of March last. Our latest news, however, from India, does not, I regret to say, permit me to stop here. The Committee will remember that in the month of March, Sir Richard Temple had only before him the accounts of about eight months of the year 1868-9, and the four months of which he had not the accounts are the critical months of the Indian financial year. The two great Indian crops are gathered in November and March, and the briskest Indian trade goes on during the cold seasons. We have still only imperfect information, but it seems probable that the accounts of the year 1868-9 will not turn out even so well as Sir Richard Temple expected.

I come now to the year 1869-70, the year of the Budget Estimate; the year for which we have no accounts, and which is entirely dependent on calculation and conjecture. Speaking in the month of March, Sir Richard Temple expected to receive about £49,300,000. He calculated on a great falling off in the opium revenue — a falling off of nearly £637,000, as compared with the year 1867-8; but he expected to retrieve this by a better return on various heads of expenditure — for instance, on salt, and by changing the certificate tax into an income tax. This is, I think, a very good impost, free from the faults of the old income tax imposed by Mr. Wilson, the defects of which have been, perhaps, a good deal exaggerated. It will very slightly alter the taxation of those who now pay the certificate tax, while it will catch the rich landholder, the holder of house property, and the fundholder who receives his dividends in India. Managed by a rough assessment, it will not require any returns or any inquisitorial process; and not falling below £50 of annual income, it will only be paid by 150,000 persons — that is, literally, by about one in 1,000 of our Indian fellow subjects.

Turning to the other side of the account, Sir Richard Temple expected to expend rather less than he did expend in the year 1867-8, and a good deal less than he expected to expend in the year 1868-9—£49,250,000 in all, thus obtaining a small surplus of £50,000. This was, it is impossible to deny, running it very fine; and I am not over sanguine about our surplus in 1869-70, though, if peace and weather favour us, all may be well. I am speaking, the Committee will observe, of our ordinary expenditure. Over and above our ordinary expenditure, however, we shall have in this year, 1869-70, to expend about £3,500,000 (£3,565,800) in remunerative public works—public works for the execution of which we think ourselves entitled to borrow. Of this large sum about £2,750,000 will be for irrigation works. £360,800 will be for the State railways, including £250,000 for a railway from Lahore to Peshawur (£257,000). The rest will be for the Special Fund works at Bombay. The very large sum which we propose to devote to irrigation includes rather more than £1,000,000 (£1,055,000), which we have lately paid under the provisions of an Act of Parliament of this Session, for the transfer to us of the great works commenced by the East India Irrigation Company in the delta of the Mahanuddy in Orissa, and of certain rights, which that company had, to make irrigation works in the province of Behar. A further sum of about £600,000 will be spent in various parts of India, much of it in connection with the Ganges and Jumna river system, some of it near Poona, and in many other places. Irrigation is, I need not say, of the last importance in the development of our great Indian estate, and we shall spend, I believe, a great many millions upon it before the century is done. At the same time we should, I think, be cautious not to allow ourselves to be led away by those who believe irrigation to be a panacea. Irrigation would not by itself have prevented the Orissa catastrophe. Roads and railways coming in aid of irrigation would have prevented it. Anyone who looks at the maps prepared by Mr. Frederick Danvers, which I lately laid upon the table, and which will presently be in the hands of Members, will be glad to observe that although much remains to be done, much has been already effected. The Ganges Canal alone would entitle the Government which created it to a high place amongst the benefactors of mankind. It is, however, out of the question for us to carry on either great irrigation works or State railways out of annual income; and if they are to be useful, as we believe, to future generations, and if they are to be directly remunerative to us, there is no reason why they should be so carried on. Some of our friends are advising us to spend £10,000,000 a year, out of borrowed money, for the construction of remunerative public works. No array of terms can express how glad we should be to do so if we had a certainty that we could spend that sum in works which would be remunerative to us. We think, however, that in the new railway scheme which has been so much discusssed since it was laid before the country by my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India, ten days ago, and which will, I doubt not, be much discussed here to-day, we are going just as far and as fast as we dare, with a due regard to prudence and to the safety of our credit. If we find we can in future years go further and faster, depend upon it we shall be only too happy to do so; but I fear our friends who are so very urgent in pressing us to spend £10,000,000 a year on remunerative public works would be uncommonly sorry to guarantee the Indian funds standing as high this day ten years, if we follow their advice, as they did in *The Times* this morning.

Now, then, the Committee knows all that I can tell it about the probabilities of our receipts and outgoings for 1869-70. There is, however, another question which must be asked and answered, before our pecuniary position is fairly before hon. Members, and that is, What was the state of our Indian cash balances at the close of the year of the regular estimate? In other words, What balance may India have had at her banker's on 31st March, 1869? India had at her banker's, on 31st March, 1869, £10,359,497. That is, I think, a sufficient cash balance, but she will, during 1869-70, have to borrow £3,565,000 for extraordinary public works, and she will have to borrow the better part of £1,500,000 to meet certain liabilities becoming payable during the year, if she is to have as good a balance at her banker's on 31st March, 1870, as she had on 31st March, 1869. £2,000,000 of this she has already borrowed on an open 4 per cent loan at $90\frac{1}{6}$ in India. £400,000 has been lent on reasonable terms by the Rajah of Putteealla, and the remainder, that is, £2,600,000, will be raised chiefly in this country. A Bill enabling us to borrow £8,000,000 in this country stands on the Orders to-day. We may very possibly be able to get through this financial year without trenching upon this sum, but that is very doubtful, for our borrowing powers under the last Act are nearly at an end.

Well, then, I have told the financial story of the year about which we know everything, the year about which we know a good deal, and the year about which we can, in the nature of things, only make more or less plausible guesses. I have told it with an earnest desire to blink no disagreeable facts, and have, with that object, been studious to use, at the risk of incurring excommunication from all the optimist school of Indian financiers, the ugly, unpleasant word deficit. Now, however, when it is all said and done, is our position so very bad? Let us see what prospects there are of things getting better. I will not enlarge on our undeveloped resources. It may be very right for others to do so, but for me it is more pardonable to err on the side of expecting too little than too much. In 1874 we shall get rid of a charge of about £430,000 a year, being so much of the old India Stock as will be covered by the Guarantee Fund now accumulating to pay off as much as it can of our liabilities under this head. Turn, then, to Guaranteed Interest on Railway Capital. That figures at considerably over £1,500,000, alike in the year of the Actuals, in the year of the Regular Estimate, and in the year of the Budget Estimate. Now, here is an expenditure which, although it may continue at its present amount for some time, will not continue at its present amount indefinitely. One line after another will gradually become paying, and the burdens of the State under this head will be largely reduced. Turn, then, to loss by exchange on railway transactions, more than £100,000. I have already shown that the items of loss by exchange on railway transactions will ere long cross over from the expenditure to the receipt side. There was a time when a great deal was expected from the sale of waste lands in India. It was to go far, in the opinion of some, to pay off our debt. These golden dreams have not been realized; yet a decade in the life of a nation is but a small thing, and in the next two generations I fully believe that the sale of waste lands, partly to natives, and in certain districts also to European colonists, will not improbably have to some extent lightened our burdens. That, however, is for the future. For further help at present we must look to economy, and our chief hopes must centre in a large reduction of Army expenditure, and a determination to restrict Public Works Ordinary within reasonable limits. It is all very well to say that most of these works are likely to be very useful; but unless they are to be directly remunerative, some of them must wait until we can afford them better than we can now. In so great an expenditure there is abundant room for retrenchment. Something may be done, I think, in other directions, but I will not weary the Committee by speaking of smaller economies. I have no doubt, however, that if the Anglo-Indian mind once disabuses itself of the pernicious heresy that its finances are in a thoroughly satisfactory state, and once for all resolutely refuses to listen to the sirens who sing to it that barracks and the like should be built out of loans, we shall soon put an end to Indian deficits. It should never be forgotten that our revenue not only rises, but positively springs upwards. In the year 1856-7, the year before the Mutiny, it stood at £33,000,000. In the year 1867-8, it stood, as we have seen, at £48,000,000, and this not by acquisition of fresh territory, and in spite of the fact that India, after making all allowance for the comparative poverty of her population, is one of the most lightly taxed countries in the world. The progress seen in all directions is great and incessant. If India is living fully up to her income, she has, at least, the consolation of enjoying her life. We hear much about the *laches* of the Indian Government in promoting commerce; but the imports and exports, which were under £15,000,000 in 1834-5, were over £101,000,000 in 1867-8: not bad progress for one generation. We have over 4,000 miles of railways open, and we have 1,820 more under construction, or about to be constructed, as part of our old scheme, and we have a huge new scheme settled and about to be undertaken. Material progress is the mother of moral progress, and it needs but little insight to see everywhere indications that the ideal of at least the upper and middle classes in India is sensibly rising. The civilization of Europe is beginning not merely to varnish over the surface of Indian society, but to stir the Indian mind to its depths. The two great branches of the Indo-European race, which parted before the dawning of history on the plateau of Central Asia, have met, rich with the contrasted experiences of I know not how many thousand years. The ancient and fruitful antagonism between East and West, which fills so large a part of human history, is renewed under changed conditions, to what strange issues who shall say?

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1868 was £48,534,412; the total of the direct claims upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium was £8,957,464; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £32,362,402; the value of Stores supplied from England was £970,926; the charges in England were £5,710,880; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,540,435, making a total charge for the same year of £49,542,107; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £1,007,695; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £602,462, and that including that charge the excess of Expenditure over Income was £1,610,157."

MR. CRAWFORD said, it was not his intention to follow his hon. Friend through all the figures he had submitted. His hon. Friend in the course of his very able and lucid speech had referred to matters of great moment to one who, like himself, had passed many years of his life in India, and who still felt great interest in that country. He should like to say a few words upon the demand now made by the Secretary of State for India to use his borrowing powers, and to the great change in the policy of the Indian Government in regard to the manner in which railways were in future to be constructed and worked in India. With regard to the Financial Statement, the best conclusion he could come to was that the Indian Government required to raise, during the present year, a sum of about £5,000,000; of which £3,500,000 was required for carrying on various extraordinary works for India, £1,000,000 for paying the debt, and £500,000 for replenishing the cash balances in India. By the Bill which would come on for discussion at the Evening Sitting his hon. Friend would ask the House to authorize the Secretary of State to raise between the present time, and April 30, 1872, the very large sum of £8,000,000 sterling in this country for the service of India. What he (Mr. Crawford) desired to do was to call attention to the way in which this power of borrowing money was likely to be exercised, judging from the manner in which it had been exercised by previous Secretaries of State. In the year 1863, the then Secretary of State for India (Sir Charles Wood) came before Parliament for authority to raise a similar sum of £8,000,000 for the purpose of re-placing debts that had been incurred in this country; and what was the course of policy which he pursued? Why, he went into the market, when he wanted money, without any communication with the public, disposed by private arrangement of the securities for the sums he was authorized to raise, and the public knew nothing whatever of the demands made upon it. The whole transaction was conducted secretly, so that only a limited traffic or dealing took place in the particular stock dealt with in the market. That was not a proper way of raising money. In the language of the Stock Exchange, the Secretary for India "turned on the tap when he wanted to raise money." If, however, he wanted money, it would be better that he should come into the market and say how much he wanted, in which case, by inducing competition, he would raise money on better terms. His hon. Friend had referred to the public debt of India, which he stated was £62,000,000. He also alluded to a Paper, which had been laid upon the table two or three weeks ago, giving the details of that debt, from which it appeared that the securities were of various forms and denominations, extending as far back as 1824-5. Some of the loans were of very small amount, and if measures could be taken for consolidating these into one single debt he believed that considerable advantage would be gained. The ultimate re-payment of principal might be secure, and also the payment of interest meanwhile; but with small stocks not easily marketable, a loss was always entailed on those holders who found it necessary to realize. If, however, these different stocks were all consolidated into one stock in a form which would meet the requirements of the present day, the public would not alone be pleased, but the value of the security would doubtless be increased. He desired also to make a remark with regard to the export duties of India. It was perfectly true, as stated by his hon. Friend, that they were few in number, but they were levied, contrary to all sound principles, on some of the principal commodities exported from India. Every 82 lb. of grain exported—and this country drew from thence a great deal of grain in the shape of rice and for consumption in distillation—incurred a charge of 3 annas, or 4½*d.*, before it left India, the effect of which was not merely to limit our access to the Indian market, but to diminish the sales of the producer of grain. That portion of the indigo crop produced in Madras had to encounter a sharp competition here with the indigo grown in Central America; yet while the Madras indigo had to pay 3 rupees for every 82 lb., that which came from Guatemala and other Central States was free, and being produced on the Continent of America was admitted into the New York market on more favourable terms than the produce of India. Moreover, these very commodities, taxed so heavily on their export from India, had already paid a heavy tax to the Government in the assessment of the soil upon which they were grown. There were other commodities to which reference might be made; but he had said enough, he thought, to show that the continued levy of these charges was attended with positive disadvantage to Indian interests. Another subject to which he would refer, and which was of the greatest importance, was the new railway policy to be carried out in India, which had been described by the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) in "another place," and was also described in the despatch which had been laid upon the table. No opportunity, however, had been given to the House of Commons of perusing this despatch till Saturday last, though there was reason to believe that it had been for some time in readiness; the Report of Mr. Danvers on the Indian railways had been ready, to his own knowledge, for some time before it was published. The House had a right to expect that these documents would be placed before them in sufficient time to enable them to be perused and considered, and these should not have been, he must almost say, withheld, until so late a period of the Session. He believed the view taken in that despatch was based upon a Minute by Lord Lawrence, dictated, he was sure, by a single object of what was for the benefit of India. A new state of things had arisen, and the Government were perfectly justified in seizing the present opportunity of considering whether they could not extend the railway system of India by a principle of action different from that which had hitherto been followed. The only exception which he took to the action of the Government was that they appeared to ground this new policy upon a condemnation of the existing system. Instead of being condemned, the existing system was rather, in many respects, an example to be followed. The foundation of the Government policy in constructing railways for themselves was this. Hitherto, no money had been found for the construction of railways in India, except on the security of the Government, and as the rate guaranteed for raising money in the market had been uniformly 5 per cent., whereas the Government themselves could borrow money at 4 per cent, they were losers of 1 per cent upon the transaction. He was prepared to dispute these assertions, and to prove that they were based upon error. The Government also alleged that the railway companies had hitherto constructed their lines—as it was called in India—departmentally; that was to say, by means of contractors, acting under the direction and supervision of the engineers and staff of the companies. Contractors had been employed in this country and their servants sent out; and it was suggested that these measures could as well be taken by the Government as by the companies. It was further alleged that the process of construction by the companies heretofore had been needlessly extravagant and costly, and that the working was extravagant, ill-managed, and profitless. He admitted the necessity of a Government guarantee to raise money for works in India, but the remainder of the argument he denied. When it was represented, for instance, that it had cost 5 per cent to raise the money for construction, and that the Government guarantee accordingly was the sole test of the value of the railway property, he pointed to the fact that there were different railway companies whose shares commanded, not an uniform, but different values in the market. The stock of the line with which he was connected—the East Indian—was selling for 111, whereas the stocks of the other Indian companies as a rule did not fetch more than 106 or 108. If the Government guarantee of 5 per cent were the sole test of value they would all be exactly equal in price. There was another element which had been left out of sight, and that was the element of the speculation that the profits arising from the railways would exceed 5 per cent, as they had already done in two or three instances. In the course of the last year and the present year, his company had occasion to raise £2,000,000. The Government said, "It is unreasonable in you to ask us to guarantee 5 per cent, because you will issue the stock at a large premium, which you will then put into your own pockets." The company felt the objection to be a reasonable one; but they urged the Government not to make a difference in the rate of interest hitherto guaranteed, and undertook to pay over the gain of £110,000, obtained by the issue of the stock at the current price, into the hands of the Secretary of State, to form part of the capital of the company to which the Government guarantee would not attach, because it was not the property of any individual shareholders. There was one passage in the Minute of Lord Lawrence which he thought had been written without due care or consideration, and was certainly unjust to the railway companies. His Lordship stated that their capital was an investment from which a return was guaranteed under all circumstances, and that in some cases even a wasteful outlay might be directly advantageous to the officials, as leading to the creation of stock. The meaning of this—and it was so stated in the despatch of the Government — was that the shareholders and managers of these railway companies were indifferent to the sums which they expended on the construction of their railways, because the more they expended, and the more stock they got out, the more they would make in the way of profit in placing these shares in the market. He ventured to assert that out of the £80,000,000 raised in this country for the construction of Indian railways there had been no larger outlay or allowance than fairly covered the expense of placing these shares in the market. The whole of that money had been paid over, and not a single farthing beyond the legitimate profit on the issue had been kept for their own advantage. He fully admitted that there were times when the Government might go into the market and borrow money at 4 per cent, but there were other times when they could not do so. During 1859, when the Indian Government was unable to obtain money on reasonable terms, or on hardly any terms, in the market, the railway companies were enabled to raise large sums at a moderate rate of interest, partly, no doubt, because they could offer the security of the Government guarantee, but also because they could offer, in addition, the tangible security of valuable property. Under these circumstances it could not be said that the Government were in a better position to raise money than the private railway companies. The Indian railway companies had been charged with reckless extravagance in the construction of their lines. He would lay before the Committee a few facts which, he thought, would show that that charge was entirely unfounded. It appeared from Mr. Danvers's Report — which was issued on Saturday last, and which divided the cost of the construction of these Indian lines into its several elements, such as the mileages, the permanent way, stations, rolling stock, &c. —that the East Indian Railway Company had constructed their 1,500 miles, 600 being double and the rest single lines, at a cost of less than £20,000 per mile; and that the Madras Railway Company, also a single line, had constructed their line at a cost of less than £11,000 per mile. The great difference between the cost per mile of these two railways was accounted for by the fact that the latter, while having an excellent management, had none of the engineering difficulties to encounter which had rendered the construction of the former line so costly. Another cause of the great cost of the construction of the East Indian Railway was the Indian Mutiny. The question had been elaborately gone into, and the result, which had been reported to the Government, was that if the Mutiny had not occurred that great work would have been constructed at a less cost by about £3,000,000 sterling. The expense of the conveyance of materials had been enormously increased by the Mutiny, and a large portion of the finished line had been destroyed—no less than 17,000 tons of rails being found wanting in transmission up the river. £500,000 had afterwards to be expended upon the erection of a steamboat flotilla, for the purpose of sending the materials up the river. In fact, the total extra cost resulting from the Mutiny might be safely put at £2,000 per mile. It must not be forgotten, in calculating the cost of the Indian railways, that they had to pay enormous sums for conveying from this country the materials necessary for building their bridges. The East Indian Railway had constructed no less than three miles of iron bridges, one being nearly four-fifths of a mile in length, and the whole of the materials for erecting those works, and for locomotive purposes, had been sent out from this country, at a total cost for conveyance of nearly £3,000,000. They had also to provide European superintendence; and for every man sent out to India they had to pay two or three times as much as they could secure their services for in this country. The expenses incurred for drivers of locomotives was a most costly item. All these elements must enter into the question of the cost of the railway. When they were pointed at as persons who had been guilty of extravagance, all these things should be taken into consideration. What he had said as to one railway applied to all of them. It was not improbable that the Indian railways might have made mistakes in the construction of lines for the first time over the vast Continent of India; but the Government would be warned by those mistakes, and would, therefore, be to a certain degree benefited by them. If they were guilty of extravagance, which he denied, the Government ought to share the blame with them, because the companies could not, and in fact did not, spend money without Government control. If the Government said — "You are extravagant and thriftless," he said they were parties to these things. But he denied the fact. He maintained that the Indian railways might be held up as instances of the expenditure of enormous sums of money, with as little cause for reproach as had ever occurred under similar circumstances. In the whole course of this expenditure there had been nothing illicit in the contracts or profits of the company. He did not mean to say that everything might have been entirely proper in the case of every subordinate; but he affirmed that, as a whole, this vast expenditure might be held up as an example of fidelity on the part of those concerned. With reference to the subject of the cost of working the Indian railways, he would call the attention of the Committee to the Return laid before the last half-yearly meeting of the shareholders of the East Indian Railway Company, comparing the working expenses and receipts of that railway with those of thirteen of the principal railways in this country. The real tests of the profitable working of a railway company were its mileage receipts, its mileage cost, and its mileage net receipts. Judged by these tests, during the half-year ending the 31st of December last, the East Indian Railway Company appeared, out of every £100 earned, to have expended £41 for working expenses, leaving £59 profit; while the London and North-Western Railway Company had expended £46 per cent for working expenses; the average expenditure under that head of the whole of the English railways being £49½ per cent. It was impossible, under these circumstances, to contend that the management of the Indian railways was expensive as compared with that of other countries, and the Government of India when asserting that that management was guilty of profligate extravagance, was doing it a great injustice. The directors had endeavoured to exercise the utmost economy in their business, but the Government authorities did not take the slightest notice of this. The Government of India not only did not do the railway company justice, but they did the company a positive act of injustice, when they charged them with want of economy, and with the design of securing fresh profit on the issue of additional capital. The Government ignored the fact that the company had lately sent out to India an eminent and experienced engineer, at great expense, to ascertain the exact cost of all the necessary works remaining to be executed, so that they might prove at once what would be the full outlay in this costly expenditure. So far from the company trying to increase the cost, they actually refused to undertake the construction of a bridge over the Hooghly, at Calcutta, which the Government wished to put upon them, and which would have rendered it necessary that their capital should have been increased by £1,500,000. They would not have acted thus if they had desired to traffic in the profits of new capital. They had also declined to undertake the construction of a line from Cawnpore to Lucknow, and willingly surrendered to another company that from Delhi to Lahore. They were anxious to be free from adding to the capital. He might add many other instances in proof of his argument. Their object had been to limit themselves to the works on the enormous line of 1,500 miles which they had undertaken to construct, and the resources of which they desired to utilize as quickly as possible, and to do the best they could for their shareholders. He quite agreed that in the case of Native States the Government must make the railways themselves, and that where railways were required for political purposes it might be left to the Government to make them. This would afford an opportunity for comparison between the two systems; but he deprecated their entering upon great operations of this character merely for presumed economical reasons. He did not think that any Government, as a Government, could do work of this kind so effectually as those who had devoted years to the consideration of the work, and who possessed experience which no Government Department could secure. What would be the effect of the Government going into the market for the purchase, from time to time, of 10,000 or 15,000 tons of rails by advertisement? Why, not only the price of iron but the cost of freight would be immediately raised. Whereas the Government, for their own protection, were compelled to buy by public tender, private companies could purchase what they required for the construction of their lines by ordinary contract, usually at a much lower price than the Government would have to pay. They were under the control of the Government, and had the official director appointed by the Secretary of State sitting by their side. He regarded the conduct of the Government in this matter as showing a remnant of the old exclusive policy; they did not like an *imperium in imperio*. The Government had resented the unwillingness of the directors to succumb to the Government officials. In one instance the Government desired the removal of a gentleman whose position was not agreeable to them, but the directors did not think that this would be just. There was a feeling of discontent on the part of the Government in having a body to deal with whom they could not command. It was very questionable whether these operations should be removed from popular observation. Opportunity should be given to the people of this country of knowing what was going on in connection with these railways. Once these lines passed under Government control nothing more would be heard about them, and the public interest in them would be quenched. There still remained the question of the extent of the intended operations of the Government with respect to these lines to be considered. It was now proposed that the Government should make 10,000 more miles of railway, at a cost of £120,000,000 of money. This was the demand to be made upon the money market. They had been told that there was owing by India in this country and in India between £90,000,000 and £100,000,000; and he thought that they did not sufficiently weigh the effect of coming, year after year, to the House for authority to raise money for the service of India. It was one thing for £80,000,000 to be taken out of the market for the construction of railways by railway companies in twenty years, and another thing for the Government to borrow £4,000,000 year by year for thirty years from the public on that account. He maintained that the Government could not expect to be able to continue to place these large sums upon the market at the rate that they boasted they now raised it—4 per cent. He also wished to point out that had railway construction been in the hands of the Government at the time of the Mutiny in India the works would not have been proceeded with, as the whole attention of the Government was directed to quell the Mutiny, whereas the railway companies continued the construction of the railways, notwithstanding the Mutiny, and were enabled to assist the Government by the facilities afforded by such portions of the lines as were constructed. One clause of the Bill that was before them earmarked £4,000,000 of the money proposed to be raised, and set it apart for the construction of railways only; but this money would not be so spent if war or other adverse circumstances should absorb the attention of the Government. An instance of this was that when Lord Ellenborough went to India in 1843 he found there was war with Gwalior, and in consequence he suspended the works of the Ganges Canal. He took the opportunity of calling the attention of the Under Secretary for India to the manner in which the telegraph service with India was carried on. Last year a convention on this subject was held at Vienna, and every State on the Continent of Europe, together with England, was represented at that convention. One of the terms there agreed on for the conduct of the telegraphic business was that every message should be sent in the order in which it was received; but a priority in the dispatch of messages was still given to Mr. Reuter. A remonstrance was made to the Secretary of State, and then it was found that Mr. Reuter had made terms at Constantinople with the Turkish Government, giving him, in spite of the convention, an advantage over everybody else. The system still continued, notwithstanding it was said that steps would be taken to put a stop to it, and he hoped that the promise which had been given would now be carried out.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that, as there was other important business on the Paper, he would not waste time by complimenting his hon. Friend the Under Secretary for India on the excellent speech he had delivered, but would at once notice an expression which was not characterized by the same exactness as the rest of the hon. Gentleman's observations. The hon. Gentleman spoke of two complaints against the Government of India which, he thought, effectually neutralized each other. One of these complaints was, that the Government did not do enough to develop the great resources of the Indian Empire, and the other was, that the Government were living up to or rather exceeding their income. The hon. Gentleman thought that those two charges might answer each other; but that was not strictly the case, for it might happen that the Government, though exceeding their income, were not by economy saving means to improve the resources of the country. That was a danger which the Government of India should guard against. There was a magnificent field in India for the development of the resources of that Empire, but care should be taken to provide by prudent economy the power to effect that object. He wished to direct attention not only to the importance of economy in details, but to the adoption of a sound principle of finance by laying down a distinction between the different classes of expenditure which were being incurred. What he meant was what was shown in the speech of Sir Richard Temple, in which he laid down the great importance of the Government maintaining a distinction between unproductive expenditure and that which was not so. His (Sir Stafford Northcote's) opinion was that upon the strict maintenance of this distinction depended the whole foundation of our credit and prosperity. Our Indian credit might be seriously affected if we went on borrowing without making proper provisions for re-payment, and therefore it was of great importance that the distinction that he had pointed out should be maintained. He, last year, with the approval of the Council of India, endeavoured to draw a distinction between productive works and other classes of works. The principle they proposed to go on was that they would allow no expenditure to be provided for out of borrowed money, except that class of expenditure that would be reproductive, and they meant not only that expenditure that was capable of reproducing, but that which was made that it might reproduce. To do this there must be separate accounts kept, in order to see that the money so laid out did come back to the Treasury. He had no doubt that this subject was still engaging the attention of the Indian Government; and he would press upon Her Majesty's Government the importance of seeing that the principle to which he had referred was carried out. If this principle were adopted the Government might then borrow freely, because they would be sure that the money would come back again. There was another principle which they must not lose sight of; they must take care that in their ordinary balances of income and expenditure they kept a good regular surplus of income over expenditure. It was very well to have a £50,000 surplus for a year or two, but it would not do in the long run; for there should be a regular surplus of £500,000 or £1,000,000 of income over expenditure, because contingencies might arise which could not be foreseen. The only safe policy therefore was to keep a really good margin of income over expenditure. That involved both economy and the careful maintenance of their resources. He believed the principle of the income tax was a great, a bold, and a wise step. It required some sacrifice on the part of the Government of India. There was great temptation to put off works, owing to the necessity of raising funds by what was considered an unpopular tax. He hoped they might look to a fair surplus. With regard to items of taxation, he would not say any more than that he most cordially agreed with what his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford) had said of export duties. He hoped the time would come when they would get rid of duties which were wrong in principle, and very injurious to India as well as to the trade of this country. With regard to railways he entirely sympathized with his hon. Friend in the expressions he had used, and the spirited defence he had made for the existing companies. He sympathized with him as to the want of cordiality and generosity of their treatment in these despatches. Considering the work done they ought not to have been treated with harshness; there should have been every acknowledgment of the services which the guaranteed companies had rendered. Even assuming that such companies were to be altogether dispensed with, still there should have been some acknowledgment of the fact that we never should have had this great network of railways so well constructed, and so ably worked in so short a time had it not been for the assistance of the companies. Though they might find fault with some details of management and upon the principle upon which the system was founded, still they should speak a little more gratefully of those who had initiated the plans of so great a man as Lord Dalhousie, and who had carried them out so successfully. His hon. Friend had complained that these Papers recently laid on the table had been kept back rather long from them. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) did not think it was right to make that complaint, for the Duke of Argyll's important despatch was only dated the 15th of July, and could not have been produced much sooner than it had been. But it was to be lamented that there had been so short a time to consider the Papers, and that they were not in so complete a form as they might be. It would have been better if the Papers had extended a little further back, and if the origin of these communications had been given; for this matter had been under consideration for a year or two, and some Papers had not been produced which would have thrown light upon it. As to the distinction between commercial and political lines, that was a distinction that was drawn in a despatch that went out when he was Secretary of State for India, and that despatch was intended to call attention to the importance of making some definite plan for carrying out in future the railway system in India. He thought that there were several reasons why that despatch and others should have been printed, and they would have given an answer to several of the objections of the hon. Member. Now this was a matter that had been forced upon the Government. It had become necessary that something should be done to systematize the railways in India. Projects came in in driblets from the Hooghly, Madras, Assam, or Bengal for the construction of railways, here or there, and the Council for India always felt it extremely important not to commit themselves to general plans, or to inconvenient expenditure. He therefore addressed a despatch to the Governor General of India, asking them to take into consideration the general wants of India, and give a systematized plan of the works recommended—at what rate it would be possible, with reference to financial and other considerations, to carry out those works; in what order they should be proceeded with; and by what agency they should be conducted. At the same time, the Government of Sir John Lawrence had directed their attention to the same subject. He wrote to the Government at home at the same time that the despatch of the Secretary of State was being prepared. These despatches were both independent of each other, but both came to the same conclusion—that it was desirable to come to some systematic arrangement as to what should be done, and at what rate. He hoped these Papers would be printed, and that they would be able to turn their attention then more deliberately to them than was possible at present. There was a great deal yet to be considered as to the propriety of the State undertaking the whole railway management of India. It was pretty plain from expressions in these despatches that the mind of the Government of India was hankering after getting the whole system into their own hands. That policy, however, had not been adopted by the Duke of Argyll, and he hoped it would not be; but this was a point which would have to be fully considered next Session. In the meantime he was entirely satisfied with what the Government proposed to do. The principle was, that where railways were to be made for political considerations or for the general benefit of the country, but which were not likely to pay—these railways should be made by the State. There was another principle, that where railways were to be made through Native States they also should be made by the Government. Upon both these principles he thought that there was a general agreement; and he entirely agreed as to the importance of the action of the Government with regard to the political railways. He would, however, venture to point out that there were one or two special considerations that the Government should bear in mind. In the first place, they should consider whether they really would be able to take the matter up as a whole, when its very advocates admitted the scheme to be imperfect. He hoped that he might say, without offence, that there was certainly an impetuosity about some of Lord Lawrence's writing, when he took a strong view, that rather carried one away. He appeared to take always a strong view of a subject, so that one side of it was seen very clearly indeed. He also spoke his mind very strongly and ably, therefore one side was always presented in the clearest possible light. Where action was required this was a very valuable quality; but when they had to take counsel they were apt to be staggered by seeing the case made out, as it were, too good. The noble Lord talked of the expediency and importance of limiting the outlay of capital upon lines of railway, and no doubt it was important; but was he quite sure that the Government would always limit their own outlay better than the companies, when they were acting under the control of the Government? The Government, no doubt, had not properly controlled the action of the companies; but if they could not control another person, would they be able to control themselves and their own officers, as to the outlay of capital? There was a strong temptation on the part of the Government to save themselves from any outlay on their ordinary expenditure. He observed a tendency on the part of the Government of the day to put down everything they could to capital, and on the part of the Indian Government there was just as much temptation to put down all expenditure on public works as remunerative. But was it true that the Government would always keep these works going as well as the companies that undertook them? There were, if he mistook not, instances in which the Government were not quite so ready to carry on works of this kind when other and more pressing claims were made upon them. The history of the Great Trunk Railway of India did not show that the Government always proceeded very rapidly with the works they undertook. There was another point of importance, and that was whether the Government would be able to get a proper staff and work these undertakings properly. They had the admission of Lord Lawrence that the Public Works department was not in a proper state to undertake these works. The Indian Government had taken a great deal upon themselves. They had only just taken in hand all the irrigation works, and it was not yet known whether they could carry them on satisfactorily. They were now going to undertake the railways, and they called upon the Government at home for more assistance and for engineer officers, and the Indian Government complained that they did not receive all the assistance they ought to have. He would earnestly urge upon the Government of India that, if they were going to take these great works upon themselves, they should take care to strengthen the hands of the departments which had the execution of the works, not merely by sending out officers, but by a proper organization of these departments, and by regulating relations between the Public Works departments of India and those of the several presidencies; because, if jealousies existed between them, a good deal of mischief might happen. He would also urge the Government not to suspend the execution of the harbour and irrigation works which they might have in hand for these new pet railway projects. He would likewise impress upon the Government the importance of not running into debt, and of providing a proper system of account for writing off the debt. He believed that the matter was in good hands, both at home and in India. He was not afraid of the expenditure, estimated by the hon. Member for the City of London at £120,000,000, if it were incurred wisely, and expended in a way to develop the resources of India. He had sanguine hopes of the future of India, if the Government did its duty in promoting the moral and social progress of that country. The Government of India was a paternal Government of the very best class, and its relations with its neighbours and subjects were of the most satisfactory and friendly character. They must, however, look to the possibility of dark days; but the best way of providing for them was by developing and husbanding the resources of India, and making the people feel that we were real friends to them. Whatever the Government did, let them not overwork their departments or overstrain their finances.

SIR CHARLES WINGFIELD said, he observed that for the year 1868-9 there was a deficit of about £1,000,000, and a total deficit during the last three or four years of about £4,500,000; but he thought that this would soon disappear if the principle laid down by the late Secretary of State for India were carried out—namely, that all expenditure, except that which was extraordinary and strictly reproductive, should be met by income. By such a course only could the Government meet its liabilities and this country so preserve its credit as would enable it to borrow such large sums as would be required for railways and irrigation. With respect to barrack expenditure, he feared that many of the sites which had been declared to have every sanitary qualification would be found to be unhealthy, and consequently be abandoned. He did not believe that in India health was promoted by mere solidity of construction. The great want in that country was cubical space and free ventilation for currents of air, and mud walls and a thatched roof were cooler than stone or brick buildings. Where the barracks now in course of construction were likely to last some time, and where they were also military stations, the works might be suspended, and the Exchequer saved from any further outlay of money for some time. There were fifty-one places in India where barracks were either built or building. Some were only seventy miles distant from each other; and it was worthy of consideration whether some concentration were not possible. He should like to see a Return of the outlay in building barracks since the Mutiny. He believed that they had been a most frightful drain on the resources of India. He believed that the expenditure from this source was not less than £15,000,000 up to the present time. With regard to railways, he thought it probable that the strategic considerations upon which they had been laid out would undergo a change, and that new military stations would have to be undertaken. As to the Army expenditure, he did not think that the European force could be reduced below its present standard, which he believed to be 62,000 men, He doubted whether the Native troops would ever have revolted if they had believed there were sufficient European troops in the country to coerce them. He should have regarded with greater satisfaction the increase in the Indian revenue if he did not know that half of that increase had been derived from opium and salt. It was stated that the Chinese Government had renewed their edicts against opium; but this he regarded as only the means of obtaining larger bribes for the officials. Across the Continent of India there stretched a huge Customs line, guarded by an army of several thousand officials. To the north of this line salt paid a duty of 6*s*. per 80lb., while to the south of the line salt was only taxed at 3*s*. Statistics showed that in the northern districts the consumption of salt was only at the rate of 8lb. a head, whereas to the south the consumption amounted to 13lb. a head. If the rates could be equalized, or nearly so, a considerable increase in consumption might be expected. At the same time, he could not agree with the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) that the consumption of salt afforded the best test of the condition of the poorer classes, for, unlike tobacco or alcohol, a man was not likely to consume more salt than nature prompted him. He was glad to perceive that by the extension given to the quantity of roughly manufactured salt which a man might have in his possession the convictions for infractions of the salt laws had fallen nearly 1,000 in number. As to the railways, he had for a long time been of opinion that a system of public companies would work most advantageously, fearing that in times of financial difficulty the construction of railways in the hands of the State would come to a standstill; and also remembering that at the time of the Mutiny a 5½ per cent open loan did not fill. Having read the despatch, however, and the exhaustive Minute on which it was based, he had come to the conclusion that the principles laid down by the Government were those which ought in future to be acted upon. The Government of India had shown a very strong case for raising such funds as were necessary upon their own credit, and they ought, he believed, to be supported in doing so. There was an apparent increase in the circulation of the paper currency. That increase, he thought, was more apparent than real, a large proportion of it being only issued in the sense of having left the central establishment for the district offices, where it lay unissued. The true remedy had been suggested in the Report of the Paper Currency Committee. As a mark of the increase of comfort and prosperity amongst the population of India, it was gratifying to observe that 600,000 lbs. of sugar were now imported, whereas, in 1850 and 1851, there were 1,800,000 lbs. exported, so that in the article of sugar, India from an exporting had become an importing country. He considered that there were two reforms needed in India. The first was the separation of the executive and fiscal from purely judicial functions, and the restriction of all offices in the service to one or other of those branches of administration. Such a multiplicity of duties were now thrown upon a collector that it was impossible he could get through them all except by devolving the larger share of the duties upon his assistants. Another evil of the existing system was that men, unless they would sacrifice pay and promotion, were constantly being transferred from one branch of the service which they thoroughly understood, and for which they were well fitted, to a totally different branch, for which, perhaps, they had no taste whatever. A separation already existed in the upper branches of the administration, which ought to be continued downwards through the various stages. He would not interfere with the general apprenticeship served by a man on entering the service, which was always useful to him, but after four or five years he ought to be called upon to choose between the executive and the judicial branches, and, having done so, should be strictly confined to that which he had selected. With a view of ascertaining the opinions and feelings of the natives, and bringing these into harmony with the acts of our officials, weighed down as they were by their various duties, Sir Robert Montgomery had recommended the establishment of consultative native councils. Such a course would be quite in accordance with the views of the late Lord Canning, that we should abandon "the anomalous attempt to govern a country by thrusting aside every man whose birth, position, or social influence gave him a right to share in administering its affairs." Had such councils been in existence, with the facilities which they afforded for studying Native sentiment, the recent spectacle would not have been witnessed of a large number of landowners in India presenting a Petition against what they conceived to be an infringement of native laws and usages, and a violation of the spirit of Her Majesty's proclamation. Such a course could not but be injurious to our reputation in the East.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER: Sir, the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for India (Mr. Grant Duff) has admitted that it is unsatisfactory, on financial grounds, that £9,000,000 of the Indian revenue should depend on the article of opium. Sir, I object to this source of revenue, not only on financial but on moral grounds. I have always regarded the conduct of this country in forcing this poisonous and deleterious drug upon the Chinese, as the greatest blot upon the name of the British nation. Did time permit I could quote the authority of eminent men of all classes—statesmen, diplomatists, officers in the Army and Navy, physicians, and missionaries—in support of my opinion; but, at this period of the debate, considering the number of hon. Members connected with India who are anxious to take part in it, I feel that I ought not to trespass on the Committee, and will content myself with two short extracts. The first is from a speech in this House by the late Sir John Cam Hobhouse, afterwards Lord Broughton, and long President of the Board of Control, who stated that "he did not deny the use of opium being a great vice, for a great vice it was." The other is a sentence from a despatch of the East India Company, the originators of the traffic, who declare that "were it possible to put an end to the use of the drug altogether, except for medical purposes, we would gladly do it in compassion to mankind." I may be told, Sir, that the question stands on the same ground as the revenue derived from wine and spirits; but there is this essential distinction, that whereas the use of wine and spirits is constantly ordered by medical men, I never heard of any patient being directed to smoke opium. I trust that Her Majesty's Government and the Indian authorities will endeavour so to regulate the finances of India that this large portion of its revenue shall not continue to be dependent on the trade in this pernicious drug.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Sir, the Committee, no doubt, observed that in the able and comprehensive statement of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Grant Duff), there was one point on which he touched hastily and lightly. I allude to the revenue derived from opium. The hon. Gentleman said he should not allude to the moral aspects of that question. He was right; for there is no defence on moral grounds to the raising of revenue by these means. He told us that about £9,000,000 of the Indian revenue (nearly one-fifth) was derived from opium. What does that mean? It means that a large portion of the most fertile soil in India is diverted from the production of food for the people, and devoted to the production of a deleterious drug. This drug is employed to pauperize and demoralize hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of the inhabitants of China. Thus, it indirectly is a great hindrance to that legitimate trade with China which it is generally considered so desirable to promote; for not only are the pauperized inhabitants unable to become our customers, but the better educated and superior classes in that country, seeing our hateful policy of forcing this drug upon their country for our own gain, become more and more hostile to us, and determine to throw every obstacle in their power in the way of our commercial pursuits. Those Gentlemen in the House—and there are many—who are interested in missionary operations, know well that nothing sets the Chinese so much against accepting the truths of Christianity as witnessing this immoral and cruel policy of our Government and merchants. What, then, is the defence of this trade? There is no defence, except that the money must be had. Is, then, money to be set against morality? Several times during the Session I have heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) inveigh with righteous indignation against the power of mammon, when he has seen, as he thought, a tendency in our public proceedings to sacrifice moral to material interests. I hope, therefore, that he and hon. Gentlemen who sit with him will aid my hon. Friend opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler) in the move which he has made in this matter. But I fancy that it may be said, raising this large revenue from opium in India is no worse than raising, as we do, a large revenue from drink in England. I do not say that it is worse; both are bad enough, but two blacks do not make a white. And we must remember that there is a feeling rapidly rising here against the English system to which I have alluded, which is certain in the end to sweep it away. Many years ago the present Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Gladstone), speaking on certain resolutions in reference to China and this opium traffic, moved by the late Sir James Graham, said—

> "Justice is with them (the Chinese); and whilst they—the pagans and semi-civilized barbarians—have it, we—the enlightened and civilized Christians—are pursuing objects at variance both with justice and with religion."

Now, those were the words of the head of the present Ministry. But I am not so sanguine as to believe that our Government will at present act in this spirit, and abolish this evil system. I know the temptation which there is for Government to raise money in an easy, handy manner. I fear that the Government will, for a time, go on in the old system; but I do hope that the remarks of my hon. Friend (Mr. R. N. Fowler) may help to arouse the public conscience, bring it to bear upon our rulers, and ultimately compel them to desist from raising the revenues of this great Empire by promoting the misery and degradation of millions of the inhabitants of another Empire.

Colonel SYKES said, he could not help congratulating the hon. Member (Mr. Grant Duff) in having been the first to create in that House an interest in Indian Budgets. Time was—and he recollected more than one occasion—when not a dozen Members remained in the House to listen to the annual Indian Financial Statement, and this was the first occasion since he had a seat of more than forty Members being present when the Indian Financial Statement was made, and he trusted that the present comparatively large attendance was a proof that the new Parliament was taking an interest in matters connected with that gigantic Empire which had been committed to our care, and for which we were responsible, both morally and physically. He was glad to hear from the statement of the hon. Member that the result of reducing the amount of the assessments on land had been to largely increase the land revenue. He had always maintained that we did not levy a rent in India, but imposed a tax on the produce of the soil — in fact, a land tax. With regard to the question raised by his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford), he must say that the idea of the Government assuming the execution of railway works in India was by no means a new one. It was broached in the days of the East India Company, when railways in India were first spoken of, and at that time it received the support of several men who might well be considered authorities on Indian affairs —George Tucker, Butterworth Bayley, Sir Henry Willoch, and others. As to the Army in India, it was worthy of remark that before the Mutiny the cost of our Indian Army was £12,000,000. Now it was £16,000,000. The number of European troops in India before the Mutiny was about 42,000; now it was 64,000. The native Army had been diminished by 130,000 men, and the European Army had been increased by 22,000. There was no justifiable reason for this. When the Mutiny broke out it was confined to the Bengal Army. The armies of Calcutta and Madras were not parties to it. The 42,000 European troops had sufficed to break the neck of the Mutiny before a single reinforcement had landed in India, and the number that had sufficed before would suffice in the case of another mutiny, of which there was not the remotest probability; indeed, in the Mutiny of 1857, had the native soldiery been adroitly handled, there should not have been any Mutiny at all. He not only objected to the present number of European troops, but that 20,000 or 30,000 of them were not local troops, as under the East India Company, by which the great expense of relieving annually 6,000 men would be greatly diminished. That European troops could be maintained for lengthened periods in a state of efficiency we had a proof the other day in the arrival of one of the East India Company's regiments at Aldershot, which had been 112 years uninterruptedly in India. He felt convinced that the revenue of India was amply sufficient to meet any calls that might be made on it. There was a mischievous belief in the native mind in India that England drained bullion from India, and that India was consequently being impoverished. The fact being that the balance of trade had been in favour of India since 1800, and that balance had been paid in bullion. From successive Returns given to him by the House of Commons, it appeared that, after deducting exports of bullion from India from imports, there remained an annual balance of bullion in India on the 30th April, 1867, of £311,131,300, the aggregate accumulation since 1800, and of that, £262,567,643 had been coined into rupees in the Mints of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. It was his wish to have noticed some other subjects in the Budget, but the hour did not permit him to do so.

MR. J. B. SMITH moved the adjournment of the debate. It was now half-past six o'clock, and they could not hope to conclude the debate before the time when the sitting would be suspended.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day.*

IRELAND—TRINITY COLLEGE (DUBLIN).

RESOLUTION.

MR. FAWCETT rose to move a Resolution respecting Trinity College, Dublin, and remarked that the Prime Minister, in his memorable speech in introducing the Irish Church Bill, had admitted that Trinity College must be dealt with. The question, therefore, arose whether it could be dealt with in such a manner as to place all the inhabitants of Ireland, whatever might be their religious opinions, in a position of perfect equality with regard to University education. This was a subject of vast importance. It would, of course, be idle to say that it was of so much importance as the disestablishment of the Irish Church; but, at the same time, it was no exaggeration to say that the establishment of that Church did not inflict greater injustice on the residents of Ireland who did not belong to its communion than was inflicted upon them by their being excluded from the emoluments and from many of the honours which were associated with University education. He would ask the House to picture to itself the relative positions of two youths, one a Catholic and the other a Churchman, who entered Trinity College, Dublin, together. Suppose, for instance, that they lived on terms of intimacy with each other, that they were inspired throughout their academical career by an ennobling intellectual rivalry, and that when the examinations had been concluded the Catholic student was adjudged to be somewhat the more distinguished of the two. Yet the Catholic student would go out into the world without any reward for his intellectual achievements, while the other, because he was a Churchman, would obtain a Fellowship, which was valuable not only in a pecuniary point of view, but as an honour and a distinction. That very morning a Catholic Irishman, who was a most eminent mathematician, had remarked to him—"Catholic emancipation has no doubt been a great boon for the people of Ireland; but, as far as men of science and letters are concerned, it has been a dead letter. Most of the educational positions, emoluments, and honours from which we were shut out before Catholic emancipation we are shut out from still. And," he added, "this must continue until all the Fellowships, Professorships, Scholarships, and honours in Trinity College, Dublin, are thrown open to all without distinction of creed?" The question, then, was, what was the best mode of carrying out this policy of educational equality? Three schemes had been propounded with this object. First, it had been proposed to leave Trinity College in its present position, and to found in the University of Dublin Colleges for Catholics, Presbyterians, and other denominations. In his opinion such a scheme was utterly impracticable; but if practicable would prove so mischievous that he, for one, would sooner see things continued as they were. The endowments for those Colleges should be as large as that of Trinity College itself, and would amount to no less a sum than from £4,000,000 to £5,000,000. There was no Government that would propose to ask Parliament for such a sum. When the late Liberal Government proposed to give the supplemental charter to the Catholic University, they were opposed by some who were in general their most stedfast supporters, and the late Conservative Administration brought disaster on itself at the General Election in consequence of their attempts to charter and endow the Catholic University. Such a scheme would also prove pernicious in the highest degree. He was bound to confess that in Trinity College, Dublin, many of the advantages of an undenominational education were encouraged at the present time. When at Oxford and Cambridge no Roman Catholic or Dissenter could obtain a degree, no impediment was thrown in the way of Roman Catholics and Dissenters obtaining degrees at Trinity College, Dublin. The consequence had been that in that College a great number of men of different religions had been educated and had lived in harmony together with the happiest results to their country. Many a most distinguished Roman Catholic Judge and many a distinguished Member of that House—among whom he need only mention the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Sullivan) — had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin. If, therefore, denominational Colleges were established a deadly blow would be struck at the principle of undenominational education in Ireland, and every Roman Catholic student would be withdrawn from Trinity College and sent to a Roman Catholic College. Nothing ought to be done that would discourage that mixed system of education, which was the best antidote to those religious rancours and sectarian animosities which had so long been the bane of Ireland. Another scheme, analogous to that which he had just noticed, had been proposed by the Under Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Monsell), but it had one point of difference which made it still worse. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to endow the suggested denominational Colleges, not by public money, but by spoliating and taking away the revenues of Trinity College, Dublin, a proceeding which would inflict a great injustice upon that institution, inevitably break it up, and destroy the mixed character of its education. Without professing to be an attached friend to Trinity College, he should not hesitate to give his humble assistance and vote, if they were of any service, to defeat this attempt at spoliation. It was of a very small advantage to bring students of different religious opinions into the same examination room; what they should do was to bring them to live together in the same Colleges, under the same daily social influences, where they would become friends, and never feel that mutual antipathy and religious bigotry which, unhappily, too often were the fruits of denominational isolation. With that view they ought to free Trinity College, Dublin, from all religious disabilities. That was a scheme at once simple and practicable; it would not, in the least degree, affect the efficiency of Trinity College itself, and, instead of discouraging undenominational education, it would place it on a wider and safer basis. He understood that the authorities of that College had at last recognized the fact that it could not continue in its present position; and, unless he was misinformed, they were prepared to accept the scheme he had last described. By leaving Trinity College with its revenues untouched, and simultaneously freeing all its Professorships, Fellowships, and Scholarships from religious disabilities, they would take the course which was most likely to increase its usefulness and render it in the future still more illustrious in respect to intellectual distinction than it had been in the past. Contemporaneously with those changes certain other internal reforms in the College itself — among others the improvement of the constitution of the Board of the College, an alteration in the mode of electing to Fellowships, and the establishment of less inequality between the emoluments of the senior and the junior Fellowships — would, he was led to believe, if adopted, prove beneficial to the best interests of the institution. In conclusion, he trusted that his personal connection with that subject would cease that evening. It was the duty and the privilege of the advanced Liberal party to advocate questions which were in a minority. When their proposals had advanced to such a point as to be ripe for legislation in that House, then they ought to resign them to the Treasury Bench, the occupants of which should reap the fruits of their past efforts. In relinquishing the question of Trinity College, Dublin, he placed it in the hands of the Prime Minister with the most sincere pleasure, knowing that it would give the right hon. Gentleman another opportunity of passing a great measure of justice to Ireland. Since he had had charge of the question it had gone through many strange vicissitudes. Only last year it was thought to be so awkward and troublesome a subject that its discussion was thwarted by counting out the House at four o'clock in the afternoon. Little then had he supposed that in nine months after that "count out" the Prime Minister would admit that it was a question which must be dealt with, or that the authorities of Trinity College would themselves give a conciliatory reception to his Motion. He hoped that next Session the Government would propose a measure on the subject; and if it was based on the principle of placing all the inhabitants of Ireland, whatever might be their religious opinions, in a position of strict equality in regard to University education, it would be alike his duty and his pleasure to give it a silent but cordial support. If, however, the Government should be unwilling to do that, then he should see that the House should have an opportunity of affirming the great and important principle that the splendid educational endowments of the United Kingdom should be so administered as not to promote the opinions of any particular sect, but rather with a view to destroying the rivalry of religious rancour and of promoting the moral, mental, and material advancement of the nation.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, those who are not members of the Established Church cannot be placed in a position of equality with regard to University Education in Ireland until all the Fellowships and Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, are freed from all religious disabilities."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

DR. BALL: At this period of the Session, and with the great amount of Public Business which remains undisposed of, it is impossible to enter upon the very extensive question raised by the hon. Gentleman in such a manner as its importance demands. It is quite plain that you cannot consider the case of the University of Dublin or of Trinity College, which is in effect that University, without considering the position of the other Colleges in Ireland. In fact, you must consider, if you enter upon the question, the whole system of collegiate education in Ireland. Now, it is quite unnecessary to say that no more extensive or more important subject for discussion or investigation can be proposed. It is not with a view of entering upon this extended subject that I rise, but in consequence of a communication made to me by the Board of Trinity College, to the effect that whereas, on former occasions they did petition in opposition to the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton, they do on the present occasion feel it their duty not to petition against it or oppose it. The Board, in taking that course, have been actuated by the consideration of the change which has occurred with regard to the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland. The Board were of opinion —and I believe history confirms them in the opinion — that the prominent and main object of the foundation of the University of Dublin was to place a great educational institution in connection with the Church which was a very short time before established in Ireland—the same Church as had been established in England—the Protestant Episcopal Church, according to the faith of the Church of England. It was the liberality of the University itself which afterwards expanded its sphere of action and provided general education for all religious denominations; but the main object, as I have said, was originally education in connection with the Established Church. As long as that Church remained the Established Church of Ireland, it is plain that the Governing Body of the University, which the Board were, could not support a Motion which went to introduce among the Governing Body persons of other religious persuasions than that for the maintenance of which the University had been established, without infringing upon the object of the original foundation; and, therefore, when the hon. Member proposed to open the Scholarships, senior Fellowships, and membership of the Governing and Teaching Body to the professors of different creeds, the University heretofore opposed the Motion. But now when the Legislature has, by the Irish Church Act of this Session, terminated the connection between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the State and the policy on which that connection was founded, the Board feel that they are no longer called upon or in a position to oppose the Motion. And here I wish to call the attention of the House — because in this respect I do not think that justice has been done to the University — to the fact that long since they opened all their Professorships, except those connected with the Divinity School, and all their other honours and emoluments, except Fellowships, to persons of every religion. The offices limited to Protestants are—1, Fellowships; 2, Foundation Scholarships; and 3, Professorships confined to Fellows, or ex-Fellows, which are as follows:—Regius Professorship of Divinity, Archbishop King's ditto, Hebrew, (salary only £60), and Lectureships in the Divinity School. All other Professorships, without distinction, are open to Roman Catholics and Dissenters. For example — Feudal and English Law, salary £700; Civil Law, salary £210; Anatomy, emoluments over £1,200 (now held by a Presbyterian); Chemistry, emoluments nearly £1,000; Surgery, Botany, and all other Professorships in the School of Medicine; all the professorships in the Engineering School, that of Political Economy—which is at present held by a Roman Catholic—Sanscrit, Arabic, and the Professorships of modern languages. The Arabic Professor is a Mahomedan. All the Medical Professorships were opened to persons of all religious denominations, by an Act passed in the year 1867, promoted by the Board, and with their sanction. Fourteen University Studentships—the entire number—are open to Roman Catholics; three are actually held by Roman Catholics: all University honours and prizes, without distinction, except those in the Divinity School (the amount annually distributed is about £1,000); and all Exhibitions, except those which by original foundation are limited to Divinity students or sons of clergymen are also open. Now, taking as the basis what the Board had laid down for itself, that the University was connected with an Established Church, and was founded in the interest of that Church, I say, with the exception of the Fellowships which, as connected with the Governing Body, they considered to be essentially and intrinsically connected with this primary and paramount interest, they have always shown the greatest liberality to persons of a different religious persuasion. They opened all the various prizes and Professorships, with the exceptions that I have stated; and, as I have mentioned before, at this moment there are Roman Catholics holding these College emoluments. The number of Roman Catholics and Dissenters educated at the University has always borne a fair proportion to the number of Episcopalians, and there has always been a large number of persons not members of the Established Church receiving their education there. For myself, I must say that I believe one of the greatest benefits ever conferred on the country was that this University at an early period admitted persons of all persuasions to the advantages of education. I admit that the Professorships and other offices have been opened only in recent years—I believe since the Union; but before the Union Roman Catholics and Dissenters were admitted to education in the University, and from that period to the present time no man has ever said there was any attempt to interfere with the religion of any person educated in the University; no man has ever complained of the way in which the Roman Catholic students were dealt with, as regards the distribution of the honours or advantages held out to them. The confidence which this honourable conduct created led to a large proportion of the Roman Catholics, distinguished in the legal and medical professions and in public life, receiving their education in Trinity College. Protestant and Catholic met together to pursue the same studies and imbibe the elevated and generous sentiments which those studies inspire. Hence arose mutual esteem and respect, friendships and intimacies, mitigating and softening differences of opinion upon public questions in after life. One of the most important testimonies in support of the principles which ought to be kept in mind in any legislation on this subject, is a petition by the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland to the Irish House of Commons, in 1795, at the time when

Maynooth was founded. The petition was presented by their great advocate, Henry Grattan, in opposition to that foundation, and on what ground? On the ground that Maynooth, which originally was not confined to ecclesiastics, but was open to laymen, was to be devoted to Roman Catholics, while Protestants were to be excluded. That petition says—

> "The petitioners submit that if the youth of both religions were instructed together in those branches of classical education which are the same for all; their peculiar tenets would be no hindrance hereafter to a friendly and liberal intercourse through life; that the petitioners having received the permission of having their youth educated along with the Protestant youth of the kingdom in the University of Dublin, and experience having fully demonstrated the wisdom and utility of that permission, they see with deep concern the principle of separation and exclusion revived and re-enacted."

This is an extremely remarkable document, and it is the only one in which, as far as I am aware, the educated Roman Catholic laity of Ireland have expressed their opinions on the subject. The only observation I wish now to make in reference to the general question, is to express my earnest hope that in any future legislation, nothing will be done which shall have the slightest tendency to diminish the beneficial effect that is to be derived from men of every variety of religious opinion being educated together, and living on terms of intimacy from the earliest period of their lives.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: I hope it will not be considered unreasonable if I request the hon. Member who has brought this subject forward (Mr. Fawcett) not to press his Motion to a division, or, if in case he should not yield to my appeal, I move the Previous Question. I fully admit that the two speeches we have just heard are speeches of very great interest upon a most important question. The speech of the hon. Member for Brighton was marked by all the sincerity and earnestness which he always brings to bear on this important subject; and the speech of the right hon. and learned Member for the University (Dr. Ball) has shown a spirit most creditable to the right hon. Gentleman and to the great institution he represents. I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that he does not object to the Motion of the hon. Member on the part of those whom he represents; but there is a ground upon which the Government and, I think, the House cannot accept the Motion as it stands. The Resolution of the hon. Member for Brighton implies more than we can with prudence or safety accept, with due consideration for those whose interests and feelings we are bound to consider. The Motion is couched in strong and even indignant terms; it calls upon the House to affirm that a certain change in the University system of Ireland is the only change that can satisfy the claims of justice or, I presume, the rights and feelings of the people of Ireland; but it is a question whether the change asked for is in accordance with the feelings of those who have a right to complain of the present educational system of Ireland. Upon that point I am bound to say we have not sufficient evidence to bring us to an affirmative conclusion; indeed, on the contrary, we have reason to believe, from the long controversies which have already occurred upon the subject, and from the further controversy which may be anticipated, that the change demanded by the Motion before us would not by itself satisfy those who believe themselves aggrieved by the system of education in Ireland as regards the higher branches. The Motion of the hon. Member implies that the great University College of Dublin, Trinity College, shall be thrown open to all comers without religious tests being imposed upon those who are to enjoy any of its emoluments or dignities. With that doctrine I am certainly not here to quarrel; but what I have to say is that, judging from the experience of the past, that doctrine does not meet all the views of large bodies of the Irish people, because their grievance is not that they cannot obtain the dignities and emoluments of Trinity College, Dublin, in consequence of the religious tests imposed, but that a large part of the Irish population are unable to obtain a University degree without passing through Colleges constructed upon a system which is not approved by their consciences. That is the grievance with which we have been often asked to deal, and it is not met by the Motion of the hon. Member. We all know that there is no access in Ireland to a University degree except through the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University on the one hand, or through Trinity College and the University of Dublin on the other; this is a matter of complaint by a large body of the Irish people, and the change suggested by the hon. Member would not satisfy the complainers, although it goes a long way in another direction in which the hon. Member has my sympathies largely with him; the change suggested, in fact, gives no opening for the attainment of a University degree except through Colleges constructed on the principle of mixed education. This is the only objection I have to the hon Member's Motion, but it is an objection which makes it impossible for the Government to endorse it in its present form. I have listened with great satisfaction to a great deal that has been said by my hon. Friend and my right hon. and learned Friend on this subject; but I am bound not to limit the action of the Government or of Parliament to the change suggested, inasmuch as the Motion evidently excludes any other change in the higher branches of the Irish educational system. Perhaps the hon. Member will excuse me if I point out one circumstance of a general nature of vital consequence which must be taken into consideration in dealing with this matter. The difficulty of framing a satisfactory educational system is far greater in a case where you have, as in Ireland, to deal with a Protestant and a Roman Catholic population, than where you have, as in England or Scotland, to deal only with a variety of Protestant denominations. That is a circumstance which is continually forcing itself upon me as one who knows something of these questions both in England and in Ireland; and those whose experience is derived simply from educational affairs in England or Scotland are very often misled by that experience when they come to review an educational system designed to meet the wants of a people composed of Protestants and Roman Catholics. The difficulties in our way are obviously, for this reason, far greater in the case of Ireland than in the case of Scotland or England, and demand from us corresponding caution. Feeling therefore, and asserting on the part of the Government, the duty of dealing with that grievance of a large portion of the people of Ireland to which I have alluded — the grievance that they cannot gain a University degree in their own country without doing violence to their conscience—I am bound to say I am not able to pledge the Government to the terms of the Motion of the hon. Member. Perhaps as the hon. Member has by bringing forward his Motion re-excited interest in the subject, and, as I fully admit, that it will be the duty of the Government to deal with it, he will not think it necessary to divide the House upon the question.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that if he had to consider simply in the light of the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he should divide the House or not, he would be obliged at all risks to divide, because he disagreed so entirely from every sentiment the right hon. Gentleman had expressed, and because the whole tone of his remarks was so contradictory of the true principles of Liberalism. But many Irish Members had left the House, and the present attendance was so meagre that a division would not probably test the feeling of the House, and for this reason he proposed to withdraw his Motion. He had listened to the two speeches that had been delivered from the front Benches, and pronounced them the most remarkable and perhaps the most significant he had listened to since he had been in Parliament. The speech of the right hon. and learned Member for the Dublin University (Dr. Ball) was liberal and enlightened, and he agreed with every word of it; indeed, he was bound in candour to say he had never heard the advantages of undenominational education put more forcibly than when he described the benefits which result from bringing persons of different religious opinions within the educational advantages of Trinity College. This Motion, which was too wide and sweeping to be accepted by the Government, was, according to the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin, already accepted by the institution which we were accustomed to look upon as the centre of Conservatism. As a supporter of the Government, he believed it best that if he meant to oppose their policy he should frankly tell them so in time. In reply to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he would observe that he thought the whole line of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman pointed clearly, distinctly, and unmistakably to the establishment of denominational Colleges in Ireland; and of all schemes that could be proposed there was none that he should feel it his duty so warmly and so strenuously to oppose. In this respect his opinions were those of the English and the Scotch constituencies, and of the great majority of the Liberal Members. What did the Secretary for Ireland mean to do in order to carry out his scheme of denominational education? His Government had already tried their hand at founding a denominational College; they attempted to force a supplemental charter upon the Queen's University. ["No, no!"] It was not the present Government, but it was the late Liberal Government, of which many right hon. Gentlemen now on the Treasury Bench were Members. They attempted to grant a supplemental charter to the Queen's University; he opposed the Motion, and he knew something about it; and, but for the determination of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lowe), the unfortunate scheme would have been carried out. Remembering what occurred last year, he would add that, if there were any force or reason in the remarks of the Secretary for Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman was bound to support the scheme of Lord Mayo for the establishment of a Catholic University. Listening to the right hon. Gentleman, he could well have supposed it was Lord Mayo come back to advocate the policy of "levelling up." Although he would not divide the House, he trusted the Government would re-consider their opinions upon this question. He would earnestly and emphatically entreat them to remember, before it was too late, that there was nothing which the Liberal party in this country and in Scotland more deeply cherished, and were more firmly pledged to, than the carrying out of undenominational education. In conclusion, he begged to withdraw the Motion.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he would not have risen but for the remarks just made. There were men who assumed to themselves a peculiar Liberalism, and who would ride to death theories which they believed to be imbued with Liberalism; but they were not liberal in attempting to force their own favourite abstract ideas on multitudes of people. Now, it was to him a subject of regret that an hon. Gentleman, a Professor of a distinguished University, should get up in that House, and, speaking on behalf of Liberalism, put forward a theory which he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) as a Liberal Member begged to repudiate. He would also inform that hon. Gentleman that if he would have regard to true Liberalism he must consult the feelings of the people for whom it was proposed to legislate. The hon. Gentleman had said that anyone who knew Ireland would share his opinion. Did the hon. Gentleman, in the presence of the Irish representatives, mean to assume that he spoke with the authority of a Delphic Oracle on this subject? He might profess to know as much of his own country as the learned Professor, and his belief was that the Resolution proposed by the hon. Gentleman would find no favour with the great mass of the people; but an idea had been put forward by a Member of the Government which might be fairly accepted as a compromise between those who wanted an essentially denominational system and those who wished for a University open to all. It had been stated that it was possible to connect with the University of Dublin colleges for Catholics and Presbyterians, who, having received their education in their own Colleges, might enter into fair and honourable competition with men of all opinions and creeds, in the examination of the University for the degrees which it might confer. He merely rose to protest against the assumption on the part of the hon. Gentleman of a peculiar Liberalism. He not unfrequently found that men who spoke most about liberty were, in regard to all questions about which they entertained peculiar theories which were not accepted, the most illiberal and dogmatic.

Mr. BRUCE said, his object in rising was to protest against the distortion of the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland of which the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) had been guilty, no doubt, unintentionally, and to his entire misrepresentation of the conduct of the Government of Earl Russell with respect to the proposal of a supplemental charter for the Queen's University. What the right hon. Gentleman said was that he objected to the Motion of the hon. Member because it did not provide for that which was the great need of Ireland, which was an examining body for all Ireland—the creation, either in the University of Dublin or elsewhere, of a body to which all persons, whether coming from Colleges, denominational schools, or elsewhere, might go for a degree. With reference to the project of the Government of Earl Russell, he would speak of what he knew, because he was in Ireland at the time, and had much to do with the negotiation of the matter; and he affirmed most distinctly that there was nothing in that negotiation which had for its object the encouragement of denominational education, or the discouragement of the mixed system pursued in the Queen's Colleges. All that was proposed by the Government of Earl Russell was that the charter of the Queen's University might be so enlarged that it might examine not only the members of the Queen's Colleges, with which it was not proposed to meddle, but all persons who might present themselves from any part of Ireland. That was the simple object of what was proposed, and it had nothing of the character which was imputed to it, and which the hon. Member for Brighton represented it to have. When the hon. Member first brought similar charges against the Government of Lord Russell, they had been explicitly contradicted; and now that they were repeated he could not refrain from repeating the denial of their accuracy or justice.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NATIONAL DEBT.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. LAMBERT rose to call the attention of the House to the financial position of the country with regard to the National Debt, and to move a Resolution in favour of steps being taken to reduce it gradually. The hon. Gentleman said, if he wanted a precedent for his Motion he should point to the case of America. She commenced her late war with no debt at all, and at the end of it had a debt almost equal to ours in amount and larger in interest, and America had all her resources within herself. Our position was very different, for we draw a large portion of the necessaries of life from abroad, our vessels are scattered over every sea to bring them to us, or to carry away our productions to pay for them. In case of war, as Mr. Reverdy Johnson had said in one of his speeches, we should be in a worse position than any other nation. Our vessels would be preyed upon by privateers from every port, our commerce ruined, and our supplies stopped. Now, therefore, when we were at peace and prosperous, was the time to reduce this enormous debt, which hung like a millstone round our necks. In a smooth sea we might swim with it, but in troubled water it might swamp us. During four years since the termination of their war America had paid off £100,000,000 of debt, or at the rate of £25,000,000 a year, and was still reducing it. Belgium was gradually reducing her debt, which now only amounted to £25,000,000, little more than three times the amount of her annual revenue. Let us follow their example and put our house in order while yet it was in our power to do so. The question would be asked, how was this to be done? and several ways had been suggested. One was by converting our debt into terminable annuities. He did not, however, see how this could well be done, and he would prefer to "take the bull by the horns" and have a special direct tax for the purpose. An increase in the income tax would be best, and he suggested that to the present 5*d.* 7*d.* should be added, making the tax 1*s.* in the pound. Including compound interest at 3 per cent, this would enable us to entirely sweep away our debt in thirty-two and a-half years; but in all probability, owing to the increased wealth of the country, it would be paid off in twenty or twenty-five years. As to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's last Budget, he regretted that, when the duty on wine, the rich man's luxury, had been so much reduced, a corresponding reduction had not been made in beer, which was not only the luxury, but the necessary of the poor man. What could supply the waste and exhaustion of the body so well as good beer? Instead of taking off a 1*d.* on the income tax, which nobody expected, and the 1*s.* registration duty on corn, amounting together to more than £2,000,000, he would have liked to see the malt tax reduced to that extent. In his Budget the right hon. Gentleman did not allude to the National Debt, making only a passing remark on the floating debt. The expense of the Abyssinian War was probably the reason why he proposed no reduction in the debt this year. It was to be hoped, however, that next year he would come forward with a bolder policy, and say to the House and the people of this country—"Your position with regard to your National Debt is unsatisfactory and even dangerous, and if you consider your own interests and the interests of your children, you will submit to a tax to pay off your debt." The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving his Resolution.

MR. MACFIE, in seconding the Motion, said, he should be proud to be a Member of a House of Commons which tried to rid the country of the millstone that might one day bring us to the ground.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that steps should be taken gradually to reduce the National Debt."—(*Mr. Lambert.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not exactly know how to deal with the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, because it really expresses approval of a policy which has been hitherto pursued by this country. The Motion was probably not intended in that sense, and the hon. Gentleman may not know what we have done of late years to reduce the debt; but if I can show him that such a reduction has been effected, he will probably withdraw a Motion which might otherwise bear an ambiguous interpretation. I have caused a statement to be prepared with reference to this subject, and this is the effect of it—On the 31st of March, 1858, the National Debt of this country was £832,843,000. On the 31st of March, 1868, it was £795,024,000. That is to say, in the ten years between March 31, 1858, and March 31, 1868, the National Debt of this country has been reduced by no less a sum than £37,819,000, being at the rate of about £3,782,000 a year. Thus, though some of us may wish to go faster, I think it cannot be said that this great and important subject has been neglected. We have, in fact, been making progress in the right direction, and I only hope that that progress may be maintained. As far as I am concerned, I should be very glad if the House would consent to put on a 1*s.* income tax for the reduction of the debt; but I cannot say that I think they would allow me to do so, and I cannot hold out any hopes to the hon. Gentleman of such a result. But by means of terminable annuities and of sinking funds we are making very fair progress in the way of reducing this great national burden; and if we can only keep clear of "just and necessary wars," and other things of the same kind, and if gentlemen who come to me on deputations, the object of which is always to increase and never to diminish the public expenditure, would limit their efforts a little in that direction, I do not despair of making still further progress in the reduction of our Debt.

MR. LAMBERT said, that an annual reduction of only £3,700,000 would hardly make any impression on the National Debt.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIERRA LEONE—CASE OF THOMAS *v.* HUGGINS.—RESOLUTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN rose to call attention to the case of Samuel Thomas *v.* Horatio James Huggins, Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court at Sierra Leone, a report of which appeared in the "African Times," June 23rd, 1869, and generally the conduct of the said Mr. Huggins in his capacity of Judge. The hon. Gentleman said, Thomas, it appeared, had been induced to plead guilty to a charge of having stolen a coat and a pair of trousers, although no evidence had been called to prove the offence, in the expectation that he would be leniently dealt with. The leniency, however, which was extended to him by Mr. Huggins was to sentence him to receive 150 lashes with a cat-o'-nine-tails, to be imprisoned for a year, and to be kept at the hardest possible labour during that time. The trial had created the greatest interest at Sierra Leone, because the punishment was regarded as excessive, and as being altogether inconsistent with the law. Mr. Huggins was also accused of having been guilty of many offences of the same sort, and the action brought against him might be said to be the action of the whole community of the colony, because it was impossible for Thomas to bear the expense of such a proceeding. The decision arrived at was one which was not calculated to allay their anxiety, for it was to the effect, without any opinion being pronounced as to whether the punishment inflicted on Thomas was legal or not, that Mr. Huggins was not responsible for any act which he might do in his judicial capacity. The only court of appeal from that decision was the Privy Council, to whom an appeal would involve a very great expense, or the Colonial Office, failing to obtain redress from which it only remained for the people of Sierra Leone to appeal to that House. A number of petitions had been sent to the Colonial Office, complaining of the sentences that have been pronounced by Mr. Justice Huggins; but, notwithstanding the complaints made, Mr. Huggins was, in 1868, promoted from the office of Assistant Judge to that of Judge. The answer given by Mr. Huggins to the allegations contained in those petitions was that, under an old Act of the reign of George III., he was justified in passing such sentences as that which he had passed in the case of Thomas. It was, however, generally understood in Sierra Leone that that Act had been virtually repealed by what was called a general ordinance of the local Government, passed in May, 1862, by which the laws in force in England were made applicable to that colony. They contended, therefore, that the sentence in the case of Thomas was illegal, as the use of the lash was certainly repugnant to their feelings. Earl Granville, he might add, stated in a despatch of the 26th of February, that there were six sentences pronounced by Mr. Huggins which could not, in his opinion, be in any possible way, explained or justified. Several of the sentences passed by him were, the colonists complained, excessive. In some instances he had sentenced persons convicted on charges of simple larceny to be imprisoned with hard labour and whipped three times, while in other instances sentences of penal servitude had been passed for one, two, three, four, and as many as seven years beyond the period prescribed by the Act of Parliament for the offences of which they had been found guilty. In a great number of cases it was alleged that punishments had been awarded in excess of the power conferred on the Judge. When the case of "Thomas *v.* Huggins" was tried it was dismissed with costs, although, according to a statement in the *African Times*, the excess of punishment awarded by the defendant beyond what the law authorized was, in the aggregate of cases decided by him, no less than twenty-one years of penal servitude, six years of hard labour, and 2,200 lashes with the cat-o'-nine-tails. All that the petitioners asked was a full and fair inquiry in which both sides should be heard; and he hoped that so reasonable a prayer would not be refused by the House or the Colonial Office. The hon. Gentleman concluded by proposing his Motion.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER, in seconding the Motion, said, he was inclined to concur in the opinion expressed some time ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State, that it was desirable that the connection between some of the colonies and the mother country should cease; but until that state of things was brought about, it was the duty of that House to bestow careful attention upon all colonial questions which were brought before it. He believed it would be only fair for the sake of Judge Huggins himself that the proposed inquiry should take place, because there remained upon his reputation at present a certain amount of suspicion which nothing but such an inquiry could remove. He, therefore, had great pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, a Court of Inquiry should be held at Sierra Leone to investigate the charges against Mr. Horatio James Huggins, the Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, contained in the Petition from that Settlement sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies."—(*Mr. Henry Brinsley Sheridan.*)

Mr. MONSELL said, his hon. Friend the Member for Dudley could hardly complain that the attention of the Colonial Office had not been directed to this subject, for three or four petitions in reference to it had been presented to the Department, and they had felt it their duty to give their consideration to each of those petitions. One of these was presented when the Duke of Buckingham was Secretary of State for the Colonies; it was referred to the then Governor of the colony, who, in reporting on it, stated that he had a very high opinion of Mr. Huggins, and that he acquitted that gentleman of all fault in the course he had pursued. After that petition had been so decided upon, the Duke of Buckingham promoted Mr. Huggins to the position he at present occupied. Hon. Gentlemen would, doubtless, agree with him that it would not be a desirable thing for the House to require the Colonial Office to constitute itself a court of appeal in judicial matters. Nothing, indeed, could be more calculated to impede the course of justice. The course laid down by the colonial regulations was as follows:—In every colony where a complaint like the present was made against an official a petition might be presented to the Governor, who was bound, after referring it to his council, to consider and decide upon it. If the Governor was of opinion that the Judge was in fault, he could suspend him, and refer the case to the Secretary of State. That course was not pursued, however, in the present case, and his hon. Friend might shorten matters very much if he would recommend the persons whose cause he was pleading to adopt that course. As to the law laid down by the Judge, that was a question *sub judice.* As his hon. Friend stated, it had been brought before the Chief Justice of Sierra Leone, and he understood it was now before the Privy Council in this country on appeal. [MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, there had been no appeal.] He understood that an appeal was contemplated, and, at all events, an appeal was open to the parties interested. In regard to the punishments referred to by his hon. Friend, the simple question was whether the Act 22 & 23 *Vict.* c. 57, was in force in the colony or not. If it was not in force there, the sentences were in accordance with law; if, on the contrary, it was in force there, the sentences were not in accordance with law. This was a point which neither the House of Commons nor the Colonial Office was the proper tribunal to decide. When Sir Arthur E. Kennedy arrived in England—and he was expected very soon—the complaint should be submitted to him; and he should be glad to lay upon the table the petitions, the replies of Mr. Huggins, and the remarks of Colonel Blackall and the Governor, if the hon. Gentleman would move for their production. All he could promise the hon. Gentleman was that the whole question should be submitted to Sir Arthur E. Kennedy.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN, in reply, pointed out that Earl Granville had stated that six of the cases were not justified by any law. He (Mr. Sheridan) relied upon that in calling upon the right hon. Gentleman to say whether he would institute this inquiry which had been so earnestly asked for.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MARLBOROUGH STREET POLICE COURT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. EYKYN rose to call the attention of the House to the charge made by the Police against three young men on the night of the 30th June last, and tried before Mr. Knox, the Police Magistrate at Marlborough Street, who dismissed the case with observations strongly condemnatory of the conduct and evidence of the Police; and to move an Address for Papers on the subject. The hon. Gentleman said the police and the public were certainly not in that accord which ought to exist between the two. The police deserved gratitude for the general care they took of the metropolis by night and by day; but still there were blots in the management of the force, to which he wished to draw the attention of the Home Secretary. Among those blots was their conduct in reference to the charge made before Mr. Knox, as to three young clerks of the National Bank. Those young men, after balancing their books on the balancing night of the bank, partook of a light supper, and proceeded, perfectly sober, from the bank towards home, when an altercation ensued between them and the police, and they were taken into custody. The police endeavoured to make out that the young men were in a state of intoxication at the time; but the evidence of their superiors at the bank went entirely to exonerate them from any such imputation; and in his judgment, Mr. Knox treated it as incredible that they had been drunk or had used the bad language attributed to them. He (Mr. Eykyn) feeling that there might be more doubt in the case than was to be gathered from the statement in the newspapers, went into the neighbourhood; and, though the police in most cases exercised their duties with great discretion and forbearance, still he found them using extremely bad language to the unfortunate creatures who were walking in the neighbourhood. It was true that at present we placed implicit reliance upon the police; but if these combinations of policemen took place, and brought about such results as in this case, he should soon lose confidence in them. So grave was the charge in this instance, that Mr. Knox declined to take on himself the responsibility of a public prosecutor, but he gave instructions that counsel should be retained by the Treasury on the part of the police. The defence of these three young men had entailed on them and their friends an expense of over £100; and as the prosecution had failed, and as the police were involved in the much more serious charge of perjury, he thought the Treasury were bound to see that the young men were put to no further expense. He knew from experience the way in which the police would sometimes act, for on leaving that House after a late division, in 1866, a policeman came up to him, when within a few yards of his own door, and told him that a dog which was his companion was a perfect pest to the neighbourhood, being in the habit of killing cats. He (Mr. Eykyn) said it was not so, and was proceeding on his way, when the policeman laid violent hands on his neck, causing him to suffer the sensation of being strangled, and led him across Grosvenor Square. He did not know what to do—whether to knock the man down or to call a cab; but at last, after talking to him, he gave the policeman a kick and sent him head first in the mud; and then, using his heels as well as possible, he ran home as fast as he could. He was told that, not long ago, one of Her Majesty's Judges suffered almost the same indignity as himself, when on duty as a Judge of Assize. If such things were done to a Judge and a Member of that House, it was natural to suppose that the lower orders must be treated still worse by the police. There was a growing want of cordiality between the public and the police, owing to acts of that kind; and he hoped the Home Secretary would take steps to relieve the anxiety existing on the subject. Some more Governmental notice ought to be taken of the particular case to which he had referred; the three young clerks ought not to be called on to pay any further expense in the matter, and the affair ought to be sifted to the bottom. The hon. Member then moved for the production of any correspondence that had passed between the police authorities and the Home Office in regard to the case in question.

Mr. CRAUFURD, in seconding the Motion, expressed a hope that a more satisfactory reply would be given by the Government than that which they gave a few days since to the Question of the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke) on the subject. He agreed with his hon. Friend (Mr. Eykyn) that the general conduct of the police was good; but he could quote instances that came under his own knowledge, in which the police exercised their power in an offensive and even oppressive manner. One evening a friend of his, who was about to leave this country for a foreign appointment, came out of the theatre when a cab "touter" pressed him to let him get a cab for him. His friend begged the man to go away, and a policeman coming up and seeing the gentleman being annoyed, instead of gently removing the man, gave him a slap in the face, struck him with his fist on the head, and knocked him down. The gentleman remonstrated, and said that the policeman ought not to have knocked the man down, as he was not committing a breach of the law, whereupon the policeman told the gentleman that if he did not move on and refrain from interfering with him in the execution of his duty, he would take him into custody. His friend having to go abroad very soon, and not wishing to figure at the police courts, preferred to walk on. If that could happen to a well-known gentleman they could easily tell how poor men would be knocked about and oppressed by the police. The case of the three young clerks which had been brought under the notice of the House ought not to be allowed to rest without inquiry. It ought to be taken up as a public matter. In the evidence brought before Mr. Knox it was distinctly shown that the policemen must have perjured themselves, and, therefore, this was a case, if ever there was one, in which the Home Secretary should prosecute. It was very hard if, after having spent upwards of £100 in defending themselves, and having gone out of court with a character perfectly established, they were to be told by the Home Secretary that the policemen were men of the highest character in the force, and that if the young men felt themselves hurt they must prosecute at their own expense. But if the young men were to undertake a prosecution it would be said that the action was a vindictive one. He hoped, therefore, the Home Secretary would give an assurance to the House that an inquiry should be made, and thus afford protection to all those who were not in a position of life to protect themselves.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Papers relating to the Charge made by the Police against three young men on the night of the 30th June last, and tried before Mr. Knox, the Police Magistrate at Marlborough Street."—(*Mr. Eykyn.*)

MR. BRUCE said, he was not able to accede to the Motion of his hon. Friend, inasmuch as there existed no correspondence whatever upon the subject. The hon. Member was perfectly right in bringing under the notice of the House any case in which he thought the police had been guilty of improper conduct. He (Mr. Bruce) was not there to defend the police, but was simply there to listen to statements regarding them, and see that justice was done. What, in this case, he was asked to do, however, was to undertake, on behalf of the Government, the prosecution of a number of men of whose guilt, after a careful examination of the case, he entertained the greatest doubt. His hon. Friend had himself looked at the Papers in connection with the case, and had read the result of the inquiries made by the Chief Commissioner of Police; and he would ask him, having done so, whether he felt satisfied that the story was so clear as it had been generally assumed to be. He had carefully looked into the question himself, and he felt bound to say that there existed in his mind very grave doubts as to whether the imputations cast upon the policemen were well founded. Under these circumstances he was asked to bring the authority of the Government to bear on those men, and to institute a prosecution for perjury against them. The whole case of the young men was open to very grave suspicion. In going home to Pimlico or Putney they found it necessary to go to the top of the Haymarket in search for a cab, though it appeared there were cabs in the lower part of the Haymarket. The case of the police was confirmed by a statement which he had heard from an inspector, who was one of the most trusted men of the force. This inspector stated that in passing by this portion of the street he saw a considerable disturbance, but he did not observe the young men nor anybody in particular. He spoke to the crowd and told them to go away, and then went on the duty in which he was engaged of visiting some night houses. As the disturbance continued, he turned back, and saw at a distance the very thing which the police swore to—namely, the umbrellas of these young men raised over their heads. That was the statement of a man long in the force, which those who knew him did not doubt. Since the case has been tried before the police magistrate a good deal of additional evidence had been obtained, and under the circumstances he declined — and he thought himself justified in declining — to throw the weight of the Government against these men by undertaking their prosecution. The remedy was a simple and easy one. Those gentlemen were not called upon to bring an indictment for perjury against the police. All they had to do was to summon one or other of them for an assault; the witnesses were all known, the cost would be next to nothing, and if they were successful the expense would be thrown on the police. In that way the matter could be judicially decided, and it would be far better than to have recourse to an exceptional proceeding. The hon. Member had spoken of the employment of counsel in the case on behalf of the prosecution. When the police commenced proceedings, they proposed to do so without professional assistance, by merely tendering their evidence; but as the accused had a barrister of eminence to defend them, Mr. Knox, from a feeling of fair-play, recommended the police to apply for counsel to conduct the prosecution, and it was only on his recommendation that counsel was employed. He admitted that the observations of Mr. Knox were very strong; but they had been carefully considered, and the result of the examination by the Chief Commissioner of Police had led him to entertain grave doubt whether most unwittingly a great injustice had not been done to the police. Under these circumstances he did not think himself justified in undertaking to prosecute them.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he regretted the answer which had been given by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that there was an immense sympathy on behalf of these young men. It was wrong, in his estimation, to refuse the inquiry which was now demanded. A case in which the police were to blame had come within his own knowledge. A gentleman, who was a foreigner, happened to be passing through a turnpike, and did not know that he had to pay anything. His horse was seized, and, upon his making an effort to proceed, he was dragged off his horse and was taken to the station. He (Mr. Kinnaird) went to Sir Richard Mayne on behalf of the foreigner, and had a gentleman to produce as witness who saw the whole transaction from his parlour window; but his experience was that no person had any chance against the police, and it was perfectly useless to proceed against them. The gentleman who had been thus ill-treated was well known at Geneva and in Switzerland, but would not prosecute because he did not wish to have his name spoken of. He had found that every policeman swore that every other was right; and if the Home Secretary would not use his influence to protect individuals proved to be innocent, there would be a lack of justice in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he had heard the answer of the Home Secretary with great regret. He had no stories to tell against the police, and was not likely to be accused of being ready to join in any cry against them. He had always been in the habit of placing great confidence in them, and had invariably encouraged others to do the same. He feared, however, that if no inquiry took place into this case he would not be so successful for the future as he had been in the past. What were the facts? The case referred to had been investigated before a most intelligent police magistrate. Witnesses were heard on both sides, and after a full and complete inquiry the magistrate decided clearly that the story told against these young men was false, who accordingly quitted the bar without any stain upon them. The real decision which the magistrate came to was not merely that the young men were innocent, but that the police were guilty. He did not profess to form any opinion upon the matter; but he said that the matter ought not to be allowed to rest where it was. Public confidence in the police would be weakened if the matter were not investigated. It seemed to him, therefore, to be very important that the matter should be sifted to the bottom. Government could easily direct proceedings to be taken, which could leave no doubt as to which party was really to blame. It would be a great neglect of duty if the question were allowed to rest, and if those young men, who had been pronounced innocent, were to be put to all the expense and trouble of a fresh prosecution. Who were the parties interested in the matter? Not the young men, for they had been pronounced to be innocent. Their characters were cleared, and they had no interest in the question, except as part of the general public. And who were to represent the general public? Assuredly it must be the Government. They were the parties who were interested in having this case decided. There was one other party still more interested, and that was the police. It was for the sake of the police—for the sake of the character of the police, and for the sake of the public confidence in the police, that it was absolutely essential that some further inquiry should take place.

Mr. EYKYN said, he was still utterly at a loss to account for the refusal of the Government further to inquire into the subject. Mr. Knox had declared himself unable to believe the evidence of the police; but no doubt ulterior proceedings would be taken, and expressed the opinion that the young men had been much wronged. He, therefore, again urged the Government to inquire further into the subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL observed that the hon. Member for Windsor (Mr. Eykyn) had not answered the challenge thrown out by the Home Secretary, when he asked him to state the impression left upon his mind on reading the Papers which had led the Home Secretary to the conclusion he had come to. The hon. Member had seen those Papers, and it was due to the House that he should state candidly whether that perusal of those Papers had or had not induced him to change his original opinion on the subject. And he would entreat the House to consider what the Home Secretary was asked to do. He was asked to bring the whole power of the Government against certain policemen—a measure which it would be excessively disagreeable for a Minister to take, unless he was satisfied in his own mind that those whom he prosecuted were substantially in the wrong. He (the Solicitor General) had not gone into the matter sufficiently to form a decided opinion on the case; but he was by no means satisfied that the policemen were in the wrong, or that the clerks were as much in the right as Mr. Knox had decided. His opinion, however, was beside the question, because his right hon. Friend had to act upon the conviction the information at his command obliged him to come to. That might or might not be a satisfactory state of things; but it was the necessary consequences of the present state of our criminal law and its administration. Guided by the ordinary rule, the matter must be decided by the opinion of the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary was often applauded for reversing the judgment of a jury or a Judge when it happened to assume the shape of a conviction; why should he not be left to decide in a case because it happened to result in an acquittal, and say in such a case that the court was wrong? His right hon. Friend said he had looked into the case, and was satisfied from information laid before him that this was not a case in which he should instruct a prosecution of these policemen? Did the House think it would be wise for a Home Secretary to prosecute in a case in which he was not himself satisfied that the persons charged deserved conviction? Would such a course inspire confidence among the police? The House was bound to trust in the character of the Minister, and it would much surprise him if the House obliged the Home Secretary to proceed in this case after the statement he had made.

MR. JESSEL said, he very much lamented that the Home Secretary did not think it incumbent upon him to institute a prosecution in this case. On the one hand, they had a public investigation before a magistrate of high character and authorized judicial reputation, who had given judgment after having heard evidence in public from witnesses submitted to the severest test of cross-examination. On the other hand, they had that decision impugned—he did not say wrongly impugned—and virtually upset by a private investigation in a room withont the assistance of counsel or the test of cross-examination, and without the check of publicity. That was not a satisfactory feature in the crimin al jurisdiction of this country, and was only another reason for the appointment of a public prosecutor. In countries having a public prosecutor such a state of things as that before the House could not occur, because the public prosecutor would interfere as a matter of course. They would hear nothing about bringing the whole force of the Government against the accused, because it would then be the ordinary duty of the Government to institute a judicial inquiry against its officers, whether policemen or not, who, in the opinion of a competent magistrate, were guilty of misconduct. At the same time, he could not help agreeing with the right hon. Gentleman when he said that, in this case, having arrived at a conclusion favourable to the police he would not lend the weight of the Government against the accused, and that he did not feel justified in taking so extreme a course when he was not satisfied that the probable result would be a conviction. It was said that the young men referred to might move in the matter, but no one appealed against a decision in his favour. They were satisfied, and it was not their business to institute an inquiry into the conduct of the police. If he were a friend of theirs he would feel very much for them on account of what had fallen from the Home Secretary; because if the policemen had not committed perjury some one else had, and the case, if it had rested with this debate, would have ended with a slur upon the characters of those young men, from which they could not have been freed but by incurring heavy expense. He lamented a state of the law which permitted such occurrences as this, and trusted the Home Secretary would not allow another Session to pass without introducing a measure to amend it.

MR. R. N. FOWLER remarked upon the very probable circumstance of these young men having been detained late at night on the 30th of June, seeing that upon that day it was customary for bankers to balance their books for the half-year. As a banker he could say it was a natural thing that these young men should be going home late at night at that period of the year; one cabstand might be empty, and they might have to go to another; and in that case nothing was more natural than that they should find their way to the Haymarket in search of a cab. It seemed to be thought that it was some imputation on their character that they should be there at that time of night; but it seemed to him, as a practical man, that nothing was more natural. What he was most anxious to do was to vindicate the character of gentlemen in the same business as himself, to show that they might legitimately be at the Haymarket at that time of night, and that the fact was no imputation upon their character.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he thought that what had been said almost resolved itself into a charge against the Home Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman had made considerable inquiry, and he found nothing which induced him to prosecute the police; but he did not cast any slur upon the young men, whom he left exonerated from blame by the decision of the magistrate. He had found that further investigation might possibly tend to relieve the police from the slur cast upon them; but he did not wish to push the matter any further, and he did not think it was the duty of the Government to take any steps in the matter. Was the House to call the Home Secretary to account under such circumstances? They ought to remember that this great metropolis was in the charge of the metropolitan police, and that the Home Secretary was responsible for their conduct; and it would be exceedingly dangerous if the House were, on every slight occasion, to interfere with him in the discharge of his duties, or to insist on his prosecution of every policeman who might be censured by a magistrate.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, it did not appear to him that the decision of the magistrate would necessitate any action on the part of the Government. Mr. Knox stated that it was an extraordinary case of conflicting evidence, which he spent many days and nights in considering, and he came to the conclusion that he ought not to send the young men to trial, but that he ought to dismiss the charge against them. What was the process by which he arrived at that conclusion? He asked whether it was probable that three young men holding responsible offices in a bank should misconduct themselves so soon after leaving it? but *à priori* argument was worth very little in such a case, which must depend upon the credit due to evidence. Mr. Knox proceeded to remark that it was natural there should be confusion in the Haymarket at the hour when the nighthouses were being cleared, and that in the confusion the wrong person might have been taken into custody; so it did not at all follow, because he thought it right to dismiss the charge, that the police were perjured. The magistrate did not say he arrived at the conclusion that the police were perjured; he only said he believed their statements "improbable." The whole story was an improbable one. Commenting on the manner in which a policeman gave his evidence, did the magistrate deduce perjury? He only said that it "jarred vehemently with his opinion of what was fitting." The decision acquitted the young men, but left open the questions involved, and it did not justify anyone in imputing perjury to the police. The language used by the magistrate showed that, while he discharged the young men without any stain upon their character, he studiously avoided imputing perjury to the police; if he had intended to do so he would have used much stronger language. After subsequent investigation the Home Secretary did not see reason to interfere, and there was nothing extraordinary in that conclusion.

Lord ELCHO said, the Home Secretary appealed to the hon. Member for Windsor, asking him whether the Papers he had read had not changed his views, and to that appeal no response had been made. He should like to hear a reply from the hon. Member.

Mr. EYKYN said, he had read the Papers, and it was the perusal of them which induced him to word his Motion as he had done, in the hope that they might be laid on the table, and hon. Members derive their own impressions from them.

Mr. BRUCE said, the Papers could not be produced without doing the grossest injustice to the young men whose characters were at stake. They contained the statements of a number of witnesses, many of whom were not called before the magistrates. The witnesses mentioned circumstances corroborating the statements of the police, and to publish the Papers alone would be unjust.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, that an extra-judicial decision of the Home Secretary had over-ridden that of Mr. Knox.

Mr. BRUCE said, he had given no decision, and he had not set aside that of the magistrate.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, he thought the remark made by the Home Secretary that, looking at the papers before him, he had great reason to doubt the accuracy of the magistrate's decision, amounted virtually to setting aside that decision; and he held that the Home Secretary was bound either to act upon that opinion, or to give the House an opportunity of considering the grounds upon which it was formed.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 215.] [*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 24 (Act not to affect certain bequests).

Mr. ELLICE said, he wished to make a few observations on this subject, and, in order to put himself in Order, he would conclude by moving that the Chairman leave the Chair. The very sudden metamorphosis that had taken place on the Bill last night had placed him and many other Members of the House in the position that they really had not time to consider the course they should take with regard to the small remainder left of the original Bill, which was called, and was now miscalled, the Parochial Schools Bill. It was, therefore, perfectly fair, in the circumstances, that he should take that opportunity, once for all, of expressing his opinion upon the Bill as it now stood, and stating the course which he would take. This question of education had been for many years occupying the thoughts and attention of the people of Scotland. There had been the greatest possible anxiety to have a complete and perfect measure of education, which would not only overtake all that class of the population that had been stated by competent authority to be without the necessary means of education, but which would also improve and strengthen the existing parochial system of Scotland. The points upon which it appeared to him that the minds of the people of Scotland were set were these—that the parochial system should be liberalized, and that in any extension of it they should, as far as possible, get rid of its sectarian character. The Bill, as first introduced by the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, went far to satisfy the reasonable desires of the people of Scotland, and he had hoped to give it support upon all its material points. Minor amendments were desirable, but upon the main points the Bill was satisfactory, and he had a strong hope that they would be able to pass it into law. The Bill, after it was introduced into the House of Lords, was largely amended on many important points. They were points to which, no doubt, objections would have been taken here; but at the same time it was a Bill which was open to discussion and improvement, and it might possibly, with one indispensable alteration with respect to the denominational principle, have been passed in despair of getting a better. But since the Bill came from the House of Lords into that House it had been wholly and entirely altered. Two-thirds of the Bill were excluded from it last night, by knocking out the whole parochial system. The title of the Bill could no longer be called the Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill—it ought rather to be entitled a Bill for encouraging a new system of sectarian schools in Scotland. What was the effect of knocking the parochial schools out of the Bill? It left those schools under the restricted and limited management which had been so long complained of. It was all very well to say that the Government had agreed to extend the qualification of heritors, by reducing it to all heritors who held under the old valuation roll, and who were liable to assessment for the maintenance of the parochial schools. The answer to that was, that the heritors were not the only parties interested in the question. It was those people whose children were educated at these schools who were most interested in the matter, and the complaint had always been that those who had the greatest interest in having the schools properly maintained and properly conducted had no share whatever in the management. What had been done, therefore, by shutting the parochial schools out of the Bill, was to leave the whole system under the old restricted form of being managed exclusively by the heritors and the minister of the parish, without any reference to the great bulk of the parents and guardians of the children who were educated in the schools. The management remained the same; the clerical element remained the same. He could not conceive that anything could possibly give greater dissatisfaction than a Bill which left a state of things which it was the greatest object of a reform in the educational system to remove. What was done by the Bill with regard to denominational education? The measure, as originally introduced, did away in some measure with the denominational system of education. It liberalized the parochial schools, and enacted that the new schools should be national schools. In what manner had the Bill been altered? It had been altered so as to allow of the continuance of a system under which denominational grants might be made. If the Bill passed in its present shape, the denominational system, which it had been one of their great objects to get rid of, in order to prepare the way for a system of compulsory education in Scotland, would be strengthened. With regard to the Central Board, he had no objection to it as it was now proposed to be constituted. He thought it far preferable to the constitution of the Board originally proposed, and he did not believe that it would be possible to invent a much better constituted central authority. He entirely differed from his hon. Friends who desired to see that central authority brought to London. He thought that in Scotland they were perfectly capable of managing their own affairs. They had always been able to manage their own affairs well, and he did not see why any fear should be entertained that they would not be able to do so for the future. But he wanted to know what the proposed Board under the Bill as it now stood would have to do. Under the old Bill the Board proposed was not too large. Three members were nominated with large salaries to do a great duty; but by striking the parochial schools out of the Bill, they had entirely removed them from under the control of the Central Board, whose duties had been reduced to something like one-third of what they would have been under the original Bill. He asked, then, whether they were going to maintain this Board upon precisely the same footing as if it had—as it was intended it should have—control over the whole educational system of Scotland? He thought he misunderstood the learned Lord the other night when he stated that the meetings of the Board were to be open to the public; and he must say now that the more he considered this matter, the more fatal he thought it was to the transaction of any business. Would they think of proposing that the Committee of Education in London should transact all their business in public? He thought that in any Bill they must place some restriction on the operation of the clause which was passed last night, and which enacted that all the ordinary meetings of this Board should be in public. He thought that on every ground the Bill ought to be postponed. He could not conceive that, even if the Bill were in a reasonable shape, and not in the confused and shattered form in which it was now before them, it would be fair to ask them at the eleventh hour to proceed with it. Thursday now was taken up, and if this Bill was to be proceeded with at all it must be proceeded with that very morning. He thought the discussion which had taken place on the Bill this year would have cleared the way very much for future legislation, and that any delay which might be suffered now would be fully compensated for by being enabled next year to consider a mature and thoroughly satisfactory measure, which should be based upon the principle of liberalizing the present management of our parochial schools, and, as far as possible, getting rid of the denominational character in their educational system. He would only add that, if the Bill was persevered in, the Government would take that course on their own responsibility. He entirely washed his hands of having anything whatever to do with it. He had no hesitation in saying that, if the Bill were to pass in its present shape, it would not be at all satisfactory to the people of Scotland, and he for one threw the whole responsibility of it upon the Government.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Ellice.*)

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE also urged the Government to postpone legislation on the subject till next Session. He felt it was impossible to legislate effectually at this late period of the Session, and no Member of Her Majesty's Government could foresee what course the House of Lords might take with regard to the Bill. In point of fact, the Government was in such a position that they were obliged to yield this way or that. He would not anticipate what course the other House might adopt, but it was unreasonable to suppose that they would accept it at once; and the result would probably be that the House of Commons, during the very last hours of the Session, would be called upon to decide a most important question, affecting not only Scotland, but the whole Empire—because the measure involved principles which, if carried for Scotland, must almost of necessity be subsequently applied to the whole kingdom. On the whole, he thought the Government would act most prudently if they postponed legislation on this difficult subject until next Session.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, the time had now arrived when they should have some explicit declaration from the Government as to their real intentions with regard to the Bill. It was clear from the speeches just addressed to the Committee that the Bill could not pass into law this Session. Last night he had stated that the measure had passed through four phases; but the Committee were now actually about to consider a fifth edition of it, as he understood the right hon. Gentleman intended to accept in bulk the Amendments of which notice had been given. He might take this opportunity of remarking that there was a practice very much in vogue just at present with respect to Scotch legislation, and one which, if extended, might be productive of great inconvenience. It was what the Americans called the "Caucus" system. He admitted that, in regard to questions on which the great majority of Members had not the opportunity of informing themselves, legislation might be advantageously expedited by the Members specially acquainted with those questions meeting together and agreeing upon a combined course of action. But, in his judgment, the practice ought not to be extended to important public questions, which might serve as precedents for the whole of the United Kingdom. He had reason to believe that the attitude assumed by Her Majesty's Government on the various occasions when the Scotch Members had this subject under consideration in another part of that House underwent a considerable change. There would, he trusted, be no more of these attempts to expedite legislation. In conclusion, he expressed a hope that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would not allow this measure to occupy any longer the time of the Committee, as it was evident that it could have no practical effect.

MR. W. E. FORSTER did not think this was a question that could be considered as a party question by Members on either side of the House; and he hoped both Liberals and Conservatives would look at it merely with regard to education. He should not endeavour to anticipate the decision of the Committee as to whether the Bill should be proceeded with or not. That must depend on the feelings of the Committee; but especially on the feelings of that portion of the Committee comprising the Scotch Members. But if it was the feeling of the Scotch Members that this most important Bill should be proceeded with at this time, Her Majesty's Government were prepared to proceed with it, whatever inconvenience they might suffer. It was, however, essential that they should proceed upon a correct state of facts. No one would say that his hon. Friend the hon. Member for St. Andrew's (Mr. Ellice) had not given a clear statement in regard to the facts. But it was his (Mr. Forster's) business to look into the figures, and he could not help thinking that his hon. Friend had very much overrated the importance of parochial schools in this whole matter of school education. The parochial schools in the eyes of Scotland were naturally most important; because they were the representatives of the old system which gave the country education, but which no longer gave it. Therefore, he was not surprised that it occupied a most important place in the minds of the Scotch Members. But what were the facts of the case? There were 312,000 scholars on the rolls of schools, and there were 510,000 children that ought to be at school, and there were 418,000 who were at some sort of school. Well, how many were at the parochial schools, after giving them the side schools and the Parliamentary schools? There were 88,000 children at the parochial schools. His hon. Friend (Mr. Ellice) said that what affected the parochial schools affected the education of Scotland. But the parochial schools only affected less than a quarter that of those who were on the rolls. Besides, it only affected the mode in which these schools were made over. The Bill still remained a Bill that would give a complete education to all the children in Scotland, and would restore that state of things of which Scotland was in former days so proud, and would make the professions of Scotland accord with the actual facts. Scotland professed to have a national system, but she had it not. This Bill would give it; and this great feature of the Bill had not been altered by any change that the Bill had undergone. If the Scotch Members were still of opinion that the Bill should be given up, then, he thought, the Government and the Committee would feel bound to yield. But if they wished, notwithstanding the late period of the Session, to take the opportunity of this year to secure that there should be a national system for Scotland, all the Members that care for education will suffer any inconvenience to enable the Bill to pass.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR: Sir, if we are to abandon this Bill, as proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for St. Andrews, we must have better reasons than those given by him. He argues that the national schools are removed from the educational system. This is a mistake. They will be under inspection, and will be as efficient and unsectarian as they have always been. All that will happen is that the £48,000 per annum now devoted to education will be continued to it, and that a liberalized management will be extended to them. The denominational compromises in this Bill have created keen opposition in the minds of many Liberal Members, who view it as a sort of contradiction to the effort for nationalizing our schools. The Bill, no doubt, abounds in compromises to the Churches and to their schools, and naturally disappoints the expectations of those who hoped to see Scotland adopt a truly national system, in which the ground should be open and common to the children of all classes and all religions. I find this feeling so prevalent among English educationalists in this House, that if you will bear with me for a few minutes, I should like to explain to them the object and nature of these compromises. They must remember that the Bill does not deal with a new country, but with one whose educational history begins in the first half of the 12th century. Her educational traditions, though progressive, are blended by time into the characteristics and habits of the people. Without dwelling on details, let me remark that there are three notable periods in Scottish education. The first period was purely ecclesiastical, and began as early as the reign of David I., continuing even a century after the Reformation. During this period the Church did everything and the State nothing for the education of the people. The second period of Scotch education began in 1646, when a short-lived Act of Parliament founded the present parochial school system, and was followed by the great Act of 1696. This national period lasted till 1843. Though it was essentially national, the schools being supported by a tax upon land and managed by lay heritors, still the Church continued its visitations through the Presbyteries. The minister of the parish also, by custom if not by right, took an active part in superintending the parochial school. Finally comes the third or denominational period of education, beginning with the disruption of the Church in 1843, and continuing to the present time. The Free Church has, during this quarter of a century, made immense efforts in the cause of education. In all three periods — the ecclesiastical, national, and denominational —there has been a strong Church influence bearing upon and pervading the education of the Scottish people. When the Royal Commissioners found this to be the case, could we have expected such a body of men, versed as they were in public affairs, to have framed a scheme of education from which all consideration for the religious bodies of the country had been carefully eliminated? Such a scheme might indeed have been prepared, more logical and coherent than that in the present Bill, but it would have been totally unfitted to receive support from the various interests represented in Parliament. The most satisfactory feature of all the periods to which I have referred is that the national character of the people has dominated them all, and modified the ecclesiastical pretensions of the Churches. On this account, the denominational peculiarities of schools in Scotland have never become marked, not because the Churches did not encourage them but because the people took possession of the schools in their determination to use them for their primary educational purpose, and not with a view to their secondary object, of upholding the influence and powers of the Churches. So markedly has this been the case, that the Church of Scotland schools contain 40 per cent of Dissenting children, and the Free Church schools 39½ per cent of those of other denominations. Hence, though there has been denominational management, there has been no sectarian teaching in any of them. The freest conscience right prevails by custom in all of them—so much so, that upwards of 7,300 Roman Catholics and 2,600 Episcopalians enjoy their toleration. All this proves beyond doubt that Scotland is ripe for a national system of education, and the Bill skillfully provides for this in a way that does violence to none of the many interests affected by it. There was a necessity to reconcile these interests, for their power is nearly balanced. The old national schools, including in these the side and Parliamentary schools, notwithstanding their excellent service to the nation, educate only 28 per cent of the school children, while schools actually supported by grants from the different Churches have 31 per cent; and schools which are either undenominational or connected only by friendly alliance with the different Churches educate the remainder, or 41 per cent. A compromise between such little preponderating claims was absolutely indispensable. You could not pick out denominationalism, the growth of a quarter of a century, and prefer it to the national system, which had the traditions of 250 years in its favour, simply because the former had 3 per cent more of scholars; neither could you ignore the existence of the undenominational and allied schools, which had aided so largely the deficiencies of the national system. Hence have arisen the adopted schools of the Bill, with the facilities for absorbing them into the national system, when they desire absorption. But let me remind those who, like myself, are anxious for a more thorough national system, what a large concession the Churches in Scotland have made to promote it. They have accepted without resistance, and in a spirit of perfect conciliation, the scheme of undenominational inspection. This is an immense gain to the nation, both as regards economy and efficiency, and gives an example to the Churches of England, which I hope the Vice President of the Council will bear in mind in his Education Bill of next Session. So far as one vote can influence the result, I, for one, shall not be responsible for the rejection of this Bill. Out of a population little exceeding 3,000,000, 92,000 children are growing up without any education, and a greater number with a very indifferent one. This Bill gives to us organization, efficient undenominational inspection, and a graduated scheme of adoption, which must before long end in a thorough national system. But above all, it gives us means, by local rates and Imperial subsidies, which will enable us to offer education to every child in Scotland. With this in our view, and almost within our grasp, it would be a heavy responsibility for any man to sacrifice the education of a people.

MR. KINNAIRD hoped the Government would persevere with the Bill, and throw upon those Scotch Members who were opposed to it the responsibility of stopping it. If they allowed this opportunity to pass, they would not have a similar opportunity next Session, because the English Education Bill and the Irish Land question would absorb the whole time of Parliament. They had now devoted night after night to this measure; and if they were now to give it up, let the whole responsibility rest upon those Members who had opposed their proceeding with it.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, that as the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council on Education had invited the Scotch Members to express their opinion on this subject, he had no hesitation in saying that, in his opinion, they ought not to proceed further with the Bill this Session. His reason for doing so was that the course which the Government had taken with regard to the parish schools was one of which they had great reason to complain. Originally it was arranged to leave the management of the parish schools as they were, in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission. That was the position of matters when the Bill came into this House. Now it was totally altered, and they were told that the management was to be changed and handed over to different parties altogether. Another objection was the introduction of the provision making the proceedings of the Board public. Further, he thought it a very bad precedent that a Bill of this importance should be discussed in the dying and expiring days of the Session. It did not seem to him that there was any great haste in this matter. They had had many Education Bills before, and he did not think that they would be doing their duty to their constituents if they proceeded to pass rapidly a Bill of this description. This Bill would have paved the way for a settlement of this question in a future Session; and he appealed earnestly to Her Majesty's Government whether it would not be consistent with their duty to withdraw this Bill and bring it in at an early period next Session.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he thought the Government were getting a very hard measure of justice. When the Bill was before the Committee on Tuesday last, the Government refused to make any concessions in regard to opening up the management of the parish schools. On that occasion a vote was taken, and the unexampled fact was manifested that thirty-three Scotch Members voted against the Government and in favour of opening up the parish schools. The Government thereon resolved to retrace their steps and to open up the management of the parish schools; and, having done that, the two hon. Members who had made the most vigorous speeches against the Government came forward and found fault with this very thing, and urged it as a reason for not going on with the Bill. He entreated the Committee to go on with the Bill, for when it was carried through he was sure they would receive the gratitude of a large proportion of the people of Scotland.

Major WALKER said, the measure as it now stood was an entirely new one, and he declined to enter into its merits when there was not time to deliberate upon them. He also repudiated most emphatically the insinuation that those who opposed the progress of the Bill would be morally responsible for the non-education of some 90,000 children in Scotland. He wished that Gentlemen who said so had taken the subject more to heart at an earlier period of the Session; if they had, there would have been a good chance of carrying a measure of Scotch Education successfully through Parliament this Session.

The Marquess of LORNE said, the hon. and gallant Member for Dumfriesshire (Major Walker) had stated that this was entirely a novel measure; but he was puzzled to understand which part of the Bill the hon. and gallant Gentleman considered the most important. For his own part, he thought the importance of the Bill lay in this—that it was an endowment Bill for the education of Scotland. If it were not an endowment Bill for this purpose, it was nothing; and regarding the measure as one of national importance, he hoped the Government would press it forward.

Mr. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, that if the Motion that the Chairman do leave the Chair were pressed he should vote for it, as it would be impossible that any good could be done under the circumstances. Whether a denominational Bill were better or worse than an undenominational Bill he would not stop to discuss; but he thought it impossible to have a more denominational Bill than the present.

Mr. GRAHAM urged the Government to persevere with the Bill. He did so on behalf of his own constituents, among whom there were 25,000 children in the neglected condition described, of whom 3,000 would be dead before another Session. Now, this Bill gave an opportunity of obtaining additional schools, and he thought that whatever objections hon. Members might have to some of the minor features of the Bill, they would in the main be found to assent to the principal project, which was that of providing the new schools which were so much required.

Mr. COLLINS said, that whether this Bill were or were not intended to promote denominational schools, the subject was so vast, indirectly affecting, as it did, both England and Ireland, that it would be utterly impossible on the 4th of August, at ten minutes past one in the morning, to discuss it. They would probably have one division, and then the Government would say that they very much regretted the divided state of opinion of the Scotch Members on the subject, and therefore felt compelled to abandon the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the question of whether they were to go on with the Bill or not depended very much on what they really wished to do. There were two things which the Bill professed to do, but they were two things of very different relative importance. The one was to provide the means of education for those who were now uneducated, and the other was to improve the existing means of education. The first was certainly the matter of most importance; and, if it were not for that, he doubted whether it would have been worth while to have spent all the time they had already devoted to legislating upon this question at all. The existing means of education in Scotland might not be the very best, but the main reason why this Bill was required was that there were, as had been stated by the hon. Member for Glasgow, a large number of children who from year to year are without education. The question, therefore, was, whether it was not a duty to provide the education which was required, and whether or not they should perform this duty now. As regarded this portion of the Bill, there was no real difference of opinion in the House. With regard to the question of central management, all were agreed upon that point. They were also agreed that the Board should ascertain what schools were required; that they should make, as it were, a map of the educational destitution of the country, and that having done that they should provide the means for alleviating that destitution. He utterly denied that this was in any respect a denominational Bill in any sense of the word. He knew indeed he had many antagonists to contend against, but the most formidable was the period of the Session. The Government had done their best to struggle against that enemy, and he now appealed to the House to assist them.

MR. ORR EWING said, that there were so many good points in the Bill that he would rather see it carried than not. But he rose principally for the purpose of correcting the exaggerated statement which had been made as to the deficiency of education in Scotland, especially in his own native city of Glasgow. The Commissioners who reported that there was this vast number of 60,000 children going about without education, and that the school accommodation was deficient to the extent of 23,000, came to that conclusion upon the estimate of the number of children between three years and fifteen years who were not at school. But was that a fair basis for calculation to go upon? Where was it the practice to send a child of three years of age to school? Six years was the earliest period at which a child ought to go to school. Therefore he said that the datum upon which the calculation was made was perfectly erroneous, and he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that instead of 60,000 children being without education in Glasgow at that moment, there was not one-third of that number.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that if the hon. Gentleman would refer to page 174 of the Report, he would find that the estimate was made of children not between three and fifteen, but between four and thirteen years of age.

MR. MACFIE contended that the Bill was denominational in character; but, if the Government would leave out the second part of Clause 66, with a view to that section being brought up in the measure for dealing with parish schools, he would support it.

MR. GOLDNEY asked whether there was any reasonable chance of the Bill passing this Session, when there were no less than 258 notices of Amendment to it upon the Paper.

MR. CRAUFURD said, his opinion was very well known already. He was ready to share with others the responsibility of urging upon the Government to withdraw this Bill; and he did so on the ground that he did not think the Bill would do any of the good pointed out by the Vice President of the Council of Education and the learned Lord Advocate. It had been said that the new schools which were to be planted will not be denominational; but no proof of that had been shown, and he ventured to deny the correctness of that statement. Was there not a clause in the Bill enabling denominational schools to be planted in those places where the Board may deem it proper that they should be be established? Was that an undenominational system? Then they were appealed to to let the Bill proceed, on the ground of the number of children who were without any education at all;

and the hon. Member for Glasgow had informed them that the want of education had led to the starvation of 3,000 children.

Mr. GRAHAM said, that what he said was that 3,000 children in Glasgow wanted the bread of intellectual life. He protested against his expressions being thus misrepresented.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, hitherto he had always believed that people died of starvation for the want of bread, and not for the want of education. The changes which had been introduced into the Bill were such that it was utterly impossible to understand what its effect would be. He was satisfied that the people of Scotland were in utter ignorance of what they were doing. They believed that the Bill which they were now discussing was the same that came down from the House of Lords, and under all the circumstances he hoped the Government would not press the Bill.

Mr. C. S. PARKER said, that Her Majesty's Government had appealed to the Scotch Members to know whether or not they should go on with the Bill. He thought the majority of those who had spoken on his side of the House had urged upon them that they should go on with it. He begged to add his voice to theirs. He thought they would have much cause to complain if the Government should now fail to press the Bill forward.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he must refer the Government to the clock, which now pointed to half-past one, and remind the Committee of what had been done during the day, how long the House had sat, and that they would meet again at noon to consider a most important measure, the Habitual Criminals Bill. He trusted, therefore, the Government would not compel them to proceed with the discussion of this Bill in Committee. The Lord Advocate had referred to the large number of Amendments that were to be proposed; and he had heard so many different opinions expressed by Scotch Members that he was driven to the conclusion that there must be considerable discussion on every portion of this Bill. One hon. Gentleman pledged his support if half a clause were dropped; another laid stress on undenominational education, which he held to consist in a certain kind of school; another considered that this was not a denominational school—all these things showed that the Bill would give rise to numerous controversies; and was it reasonable of the Government to press the Bill, under these circumstances, when the time had arrived that hon. Members were entitled to know when Parliament would rise? The Bill had been discussed two or three nights, yet the Committee had reached only the 24th clause—and that in spite of meetings upstairs to arrange matters. On the Opposition side of the House there had been unusual silence, and no attempt to interfere with the progress of the Bill in an irregular manner. Influential Scotch Members on both sides of the House were dissatisfied with the Bill. They said it was in a state of confusion, and that the House could not deal with the question without a much longer discussion than there was now time for; there were on the Order Book a number of important Orders which must be disposed of; and he would, therefore, ask the Government whether they must not feel it was impossible to carry the Bill. They had made great efforts to pass the Bill; but, under present circumstances, they were only wasting time and energy in the attempt.

Mr. BRUCE admitted the great difficulties under which the Government laboured. At the same time they felt the very great importance of the Bill; they were quite uncertain as to what would be the fate of any measure to be introduced next Session; they felt that if there were any earnest, honest determination to pass the Bill it could be carried this Session; and as long as a sufficient number of Members would assist the Government they would press the Bill forward.

Question put,

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 35; Noes 98: Majority 63.

Lord ELCHO moved that the Chairman report Progress. He said the question of Scotch education was a serious one, and there was a danger of it becoming ridiculous. It was desirable the curtain should fall before the question degenerated into a Parliamentary farce; and it became a farce when a Government, however strong, backed by a majority, however willing, at twenty minutes to two o'clock, endeavoured to force them to sit on, discussing a Bill on which there was the greatest diversity of opinion, to which there were 200 Amendments, and on which they had got only to the 24th of its 69 clauses. A broader and deeper principle than education was at stake, and that was the mode of conducting not only Scotch business, but all Public Business. He would not shirk responsibility; but if he stood alone he would resist such attempts to force important measures through Parliament by the mere influence of a strong Government. That was a principle he would resist.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord Elcho.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 24; Noes 102: Majority 78.

MR. KNIGHT moved that the Chairman do leave the Chair. It was not reasonable, the House having sat, with a short interval, since two o'clock yesterday, to call on hon. Members to continue the discussion of such an important question at so late an hour—especially as the House was to meet again at twelve o'clock this day.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that the Home Secretary seemed about to treat the House after the fashion of "habitual criminals," by asking them to meet this morning again at twelve o'clock to consider that Bill as the first Order.

MR. BOUVERIE said, that it was clear Progress must now be reported—it was impossible that they could do anything at two o'clock in the morning—and the Government would do well to consider in the interval whether what the Lord Advocate had described as the greatest enemy to the Bill was not absolutely invincible. If they thought the Bill might yet pass he was prepared to stay in town to assist in passing it; but if, looking at all the circumstances of the case and the other business still to be got through, the Government made up their minds to withdraw the Bill, he should recognize the necessity under which they acted. Anything would be better than bandying accusations at that hour of the morning from one side to the other as to the responsibility of abandoning this measure.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair." —(*Mr. Knight.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 24; Noes 100: Majority 76.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, it was now twenty minutes past two, and moved that the Chairman do report Progress.

MR. BRUCE said, it was of course impossible to resist reiterated Motions of this sort. He could assure the House that the reason the Government had been so anxious in pressing this Bill was that they really believed it in all its main principles acceptable to both sides. The Government would consider what course they should take. It would be with the greatest mortification and regret if they found themselves compelled to abandon the Bill.

LORD ELCHO said, that the pressure for time arose partly from the difference of opinion on the Ministerial side and the long speeches made by its Members. It was stated in one of the journals that four Members had in one afternoon spoken twenty-five times.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

ATTORNEYS' AND SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. RATHBONE, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Remuneration of Attorneys and Solicitors, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RATHBONE, Mr. MORLEY, and Mr. GEORGE GREGORY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 260.]

BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETIES REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. GOURLEY, Bill to amend the Act for the Regulation of Benefit Building Societies, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. GOURLEY, Sir ROUNDELL PALMER, and Mr. STEVENSON.

SANITARY ACT (1866) AMENDMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Bill to amend "The Sanitary Act, 1866," so far as the same relates to Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND and Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 261.]

House adjourned at half-after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 4*th August*, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill—*First Reading*—Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* (266).

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the paper, without debate—

House adjourned at Four o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 4*th August*, 1869.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*—Plans for New Dining Rooms, &c. [No. 392.]

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Benefit Building Societies Regulation* [262].

Second Reading—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland)* [261]; Millbank Prison* [258].

Committee—Habitual Criminals [73]—R.P.

Considered as amended—East India Loan* [251]; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* [201]; Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* [221].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; East India Loan* [251]; Inclosure of Lands* [31]; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* [201]; Dividends on Public Stocks* [247]; Harbour of Galle Loan* [250]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [244]; Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* [221], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Grand Jury Cess (Ireland)* [60]; Court of Exchequer (Ireland) Offices* [63]; Real Estate Intestacy* [45]; Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister* [23].

MALT TAX.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON said, he wished to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the Government intend to introduce any measure next Session to grant relief to the Agricultural Class in relation to the Malt Tax?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, as a preliminary matter, I do not admit that an alteration in the Malt Tax would be any considerable relief to the agricultural class. My belief is, that one portion of any such benefit would go to the owners of land, and the other to the consumers of beer, little or none going to the farmers. Having made that preliminary *caveat*, I decline to answer as to my intentions with regard to measures having relation to taxation in next Session until the proper time comes for me to make my financial statement.

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN PARAGUAY.
QUESTION.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Her Majesty's Government have any information as to the condition of the British subjects detained in Paraguay; and if it is the intention of the Government to take any measures with the view of affording them relief, or of procuring their release?

Mr. OTWAY said, in reply, that the last intelligence the Government had was derived from an account of two officers of the United States who had been to Lopez's head-quarters for the purpose of communicating with the United States Minister. Those officers told Commander Parsons, the British naval officer in those waters, that they had seen Mr. Valpy, Dr. Skinner, and others of the British subjects, apparently all well in health. Every effort had been made and was still being made on behalf of the Government to communicate with those British subjects. Commander Parsons had communicated with President Lopez, and had endeavoured to go to his head-quarters, but had not succeeded in doing so. He had also written to the United States Minister, General MacMahon, and asked him to use his good offices with regard to those persons, who, it was supposed, were detained against their will in the mountains, where Lopez is at present. The Minister had directed the commanding officer of the United States gunboat on the station to take advantage of every opportunity that might offer to assist in obtaining information as to the fate of the British subjects in question.

UNITED STATES—ISLAND OF SAN JUAN.
QUESTION.

Viscount MILTON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What was the result of the original occupation of the Island of San Juan by General Scott or by Officers under his order in or about the year

18 ; whether there is any objection to give the whole of the Correspondence which passed between the British Embassy in America and the English Government, with the various Enclosures relating thereto, referring to the occupation of the Island of San Juan; why the question of the Water Boundary was included in the last Correspondence (of which a Return was made to the House) with the question of the Extradition Treaties; the Alabama Claims; and the subject of Naturalization; whether the Government is aware that evidence exists and is in the possession of Government, by which it appears that the Islands of San Juan, Orcas, &c., have been acknowledged by the American Government to be part of the British possessions in those regions; what has been the expense to which the English Government has been put by the joint occupation with America of the Island of San Juan; and, why the Correspondence respecting the Island of San Juan, presented to both Houses of Parliament in 1860, was so short and selected?

MR. OTWAY: Sir, the series of Questions of the noble Lord refer to a matter upon which for many years past there have been differences of opinion between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States. During last November a Protocol was signed by Lord Stanley and Mr. Reverdy Johnson, by which it was agreed to refer the question to the arbitration of the President of the Swiss Confederation. That Protocol was converted into a Convention and signed by Lord Clarendon on the 14th of January, and this Convention was submitted to the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the Senate of the United States, and has been recommended by them for ratification. But the consideration of the matter is deferred until the meeting of Congress in December next. Her Majesty's Government desire and hope that this question and all questions in controversy between this Government and that of the United States may be settled on a fair and equitable basis, and in a manner honourable to both countries. Under these circumstances I hope the noble Lord and the House will excuse me if I refrain from replying to the points which are in controversy between the two nations. But with regard to other parts of the question I would simply say, that I presume the Government of 1860 submitted to Parliament those Papers which they thought proper to communicate; and although we believe we are in possession of full information, we shall be happy to receive any special information with respect to the British claims and the line of boundary of which the noble Lord may be in possession. As to the expense to the Government of this country of the joint occupation of San Juan we are unable to state the amount, but it is utterly insignificant in comparison with the advantage derived from avoiding collisions, which would inevitably have taken place if it had not been for the arrangement made by General Scott that the Island of San Juan should continue in the joint possession of a like number of British Royal Marines and troops of the United States. I do not think it would be desirable at present to lay the Correspondence on the table.

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN THE LEVANT.

QUESTION.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, before concluding any arrangement with the Sublime Porte and the Government of Egypt affecting the jurisdiction over British Subjects in the Levant, Her Majesty's Government will give Parliament an opportunity to express an opinion on such arrangement?

MR. OTWAY, in reply, said, he feared that he could not add anything in answer to the Question to what he had stated on previous occasions. The matter was in a most inchoate state. It had been suggested by the Egyptian Government that delegates from the several Governments interested in the subject should meet in Egypt in October next; but, as these delegates had not yet been sent to Egypt, he left his hon. Friend to judge whether it was possible for any action to be taken by the British Government in reference to the matter before the meeting of next Parliament.

ASSESSED TAX PAPERS.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE JENKINSON said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If it is right for the parish authorities to be sending now Assessed

Tax papers in respect of such Taxes (for 1869-70) and payable for the year ending April 1870, such being directly at variance with the answer given to me by him on Thursday June 17th, and reported fully in "The Times" of Friday June 18th; is it right for any Income Tax to be deducted from any payments, funds or rents, or otherwise, due between April 1869, and January 1870; and, in the future new arrangements for the collection of Income Tax once every year, will instructions be given for that Tax to be collected for all property liable within any entire parish, and not, as now is done, to be separately collected for every separate tithing or portion of a parish, which practice leads to great confusion?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the Assessed Taxes in 1868-9 had not yet been paid. They fell due in October this year, and in April next year. As they had to be collected by the ordinary parochial officers on the old system, he presumed it was right those papers should be circulated which were necessary for collection. His answer was that it was right to send round these papers.

SIR GEORGE JENKINSON said, that a notice had been placed on the church doors giving the date 1869-70.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that was evidently a mistake on the part of the local authorities. Instead of 1868-69, they had printed 1869-70. With respect to the supposed variance with the answer given by him on the 17th June, the answer he then gave was that the taxes would not be collected till October. What he had stated on that occasion was that the taxes did not become payable until October in this year, and April in the year afterwards. That statement which he then made was the one which he made now. In answer to the inquiry of the hon. Baronet, whether it was right for any income tax to be deducted from payments due between April 1869 and January 1870, he would say that it would be quite right if a tenant was called upon to advance the income tax for the landlord that he should deduct it from the next payment made to the landlord. With respect to the last Question he could only say that he was not aware of any intention of altering the area.

FOOT AND MOUTH CATTLE DISEASE.

QUESTION.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Council, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received information that the foot and mouth disease has broken out among cattle in the county of Bucks, and that such disease has been imported from Spain; and, whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, it is too late to consider some alteration in the Contagious Diseases Animals Bill, which may prove a more efficient protection against the importation of such diseases?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, in reply, that the Government had received no information of the foot and mouth disease having broken out among cattle in the county of Bucks, but they had received information of that disease being at Windsor, as they had heard of its being in other parts of England and Ireland; but they had no reason to suppose or believe that it was imported from Spain, any more than other cases of disease which for many months, he might say for years past, had been more or less prevalent throughout the kingdom. It would be too late now to make any alteration affecting this matter in the Bill, which was in the Paper to-day for the consideration of the Lords' Amendments. Perhaps, as he observed from the newspapers that foot and mouth disease existed in one or two parts of the country, he might be allowed to state how the law now stood, and how the law would stand when the new Act passed in relation to it. At present there were stringent restrictions in regard to foreign cattle having that disease. They were detained by the Custom House authorities and slaughtered. There were no restrictions as to home cattle. The prevalence of the disease had arisen from the removal of the restrictions, which were found too stringent to be borne without very great reason, and since their removal the foot and mouth disease had spread very much throughout the country. There was an apprehension, he observed, that the present disease was preparatory to rinderpest; but it had, in fact, nothing to do with rinderpest. It had been in the country since 1836, and there was a difference of opinion as to whether it had been imported or not. The effect of the Bill now becoming law would be to check the movement of cattle having foot and mouth disease, under regulations which, in the opinion of the Government, would tend to isolate the disease and prevent its spreading. It was not a disease to be stamped out like cattle plague, because it was curable. Foreign cattle would, under the new law, remain under much more stringent restrictions than home cattle.

SCOTLAND—POOR LAW AMENDMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. ANDERSON said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, Whether, seeing that the Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill has been withdrawn, he intends to re-introduce it next Session, or to deal with the subject in any other shape; and, whether he has any objection to state why the Bill was not proceeded with?

THE LORD ADVOCATE, in reply, said, the Bill had not been proceeded with for this reason. It related, as the title indicated, mainly or entirely to the Poor Law, and its object was to put the assessment on the gross rental. It was sent to a Select Committee, but it was found absolutely necessary to deal not only with the Act regulating the Poor Law, but also with the Valuation Act in regard to the ascertainment of the gross rental, and the effect which parts of the Valuation Act had on the valuation of railways and other similar works. The Select Committee had authorized him to apply to the House for an Instruction to enable them to deal with the whole question; but that Instruction was obstructed and opposed in various quarters; and as the President of the Poor Law Board intended, during the Recess, to consider the whole question, he had been induced to withdraw the Bill. It was his intention to deal with the whole question next Session, and the principle of the Bill would be carried out.

HABITUAL CRIMINALS BILL—[BILL 73.] [*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. BRUCE said, he should not press this Bill at so late a period of the Session if it did not appear to him that there was a strong desire on all sides that at least its leading principles should become law. It would be recollected that the Bill had been originally introduced in that House, but was subsequently withdrawn in order that it might be brought forward in the other House, where it had been fully discussed and met with general approval and support. He had carefully examined the Amendments which had been placed on the Paper, and it appeared to him none of them were in any way opposed to the principle of the Bill; the greater part of them were intended to give it increased effect, and some of them might be adopted with advantage. The main objects of the Bill were the supervision of criminals, and a proper system of registration in order to secure the recognition of previously-convicted offenders when brought up for trial. Other provisions were introduced of more or less importance, but, so far as he was concerned, he should be well pleased if the Bill left the Committee giving power for the effectual supervision of "habitual criminals" and their registration. He wished it to be understood that the Bill was not brought forward on account of any sudden or alarming increase of crime, though he admitted that there had recently been some increase. It was gratifying to find, on examining the records of the last thirty years, that crime, on the whole, had rather diminished, and during the last ten years it might be said to have been stationary—not relatively to the population, but positively. While we had increased in wealth and in population, and while the chief increase in both had taken place in towns, crime had decreased. Among the causes of that decrease of crime, the greatest was undoubtedly emigration, which, by relieving the labour market, diminished poverty, one of the great incentives to crime. Another cause was the spread of education; for ignorance and crime went together. As to this, nothing could be more striking than the testimony of their criminal records. Out of every 100 criminals only thirty-five could read or write, and only three could read and write decently well, while only one criminal out of every 500 could properly be called well educated. In addition to these causes there had been a progressive and improving system of repression and penal legislation. Of late years great attention had been paid to this subject, and the present system of prison discipline had undoubtedly produced beneficial effects. The average number of convictions for indictable offences in England and Wales during the ten years ending 1867 was 18,661, or 1 in 1,125 of the population. For the year 1868 the numbers were 20,091, or 1 in 1,085, being an increase of 1,430, or 7·6 per cent. This increase was no doubt due, in a great extent, to the great depression in our commerce and the pressure of poverty. But it could also be shown that it was not due to that cause alone; it was to some extent owing to our past legislation, especially to the operation of the Act of 1864. That Act was passed in consequence of the Report of a Commission of very able men, who, having thoroughly considered the subject of transportation and penal servitude, satisfied themselves that the short sentences of three or four years were insufficient to produce the great objects of punishment—namely, to deter and reform offenders. The rule then laid down was, while transportation itself was abolished for the future, that wherever a sentence of penal servitude was passed for the first time it should never fall short of five years, and where the criminal had been previously convicted of felony the sentence of penal servitude should not fall short of seven years. The effect of that Act, he had no doubt, had been in some respects good, but its effect in another way had been very remarkable. In 1863—which was not the highest year, but a fair average—the number of persons sentenced to penal servitude was 3,071, and in 1868, a year of unusual crime, the number sentenced to penal servitude was only 1,939, showing a decrease of 1,132, and this obviously arose from the unwillingness of Judges in a great many cases to impose a sentence of penal servitude for seven years, while yet they would have been willing to impose sentences of three or four years. There was a very extraordinary variation in the number of twice-convicted felons in different places who were sentenced to penal servitude. Thus, in 1868, at Bristol there were 54 per cent of twice-convicted felons who were sentenced to seven years of penal servitude. At Bedford only 24 per cent were so sentenced. Here were a few other instances. In Cumberland there were 47 per cent, in Dorsetshire 40 per cent, in Nottinghamshire 40 per cent, in Durham 38 per cent, in Norfolk 21·1 per cent, and in Derbyshire 16·1 per cent of twice-convicted felons sentenced to seven years of penal servitude. The effect had been necessarily to increase the number of offenders, and very grave offenders, at large. Of the increase of 1,430 in the year 1868, the larger portion—over 1,100—were the graver crimes, such as burglary, housebreaking, breaking into shops, robbery with violence, and larceny. Of this increase 646 cases occurred in Middlesex alone. The causes were general, such as long-continued depression of trade, or special, such as the greater number of criminals at large under the operation of the Act of 1864. In four years previous to 1864 the penal servitude sentences in Middlesex averaged 24·4 per cent of the total convictions; in 1868, only 16·2 per cent received this sentence. Thus, in 1868, 454 persons received sentences of imprisonment averaging fifteen months each in lieu of penal servitude, which they would have received previously to 1864. It could be proved that, under the operation of the Act of 1864, during the last three years, 635 of the worst class of criminals had been, in consequence of the aversion of the Judges to impose long sentences of penal servitude, allowed to return to their old haunts and habits, without any supervision, in excess of the number who would have been so let loose previous to 1864. In all England 836 persons were annually sentenced to terms of imprisonment, averaging fifteen months, who would, before 1864, have been sentenced to penal servitude. Had they been sentenced to penal servitude, not only would they have been withdrawn from society for a greater length of time, but when they returned to society they would have been under the supervision of the police as holders of licenses; whereas, those previously convicted persons, under the existing law, were turned loose on society without any supervision at all. It seemed obvious, therefore, if they were to continue the legislation of 1864, which he admitted had produced good effects, that it would be absolutely necessary to supplement it, as was proposed by this Bill, by placing persons twice convicted under a system of supervision, and by depriving them of that presumption of innocence which every other person in this country enjoyed. This would make the proof of dishonest practices more easy against them than against persons who had not been previously convicted. What was proposed by the Bill was this. With respect to convicts it would add but little to the existing legislation; it only made the law a little more stringent. What it did provide was a more complete system of registration. The present registration, although it did some good, was ineffectual, inasmuch as it failed altogether to trace the prisoner in his movements from one part of the country to another. He was obliged to report himself; but if he failed to do so on leaving a town there was no trace of him from that time forward. The object of the Bill was to secure a complete record of the movements of every convict under supervision, by means of a central registration, so that information might be given to the police if any license-holders should have removed without notice. The number of persons holding a ticket-of-leave in this country might be taken in round numbers at 1,500 men, and 450 women. The average length of their licenses was one year and seven months. With respect to those who had received a sentence of penal servitude for the first time, and who could hardly be classed as "habitual criminals"—persons committing generally some great commercial fraud and sentenced at once to penal servitude—the supervision would only last during the period of the original sentence; but those previously convicted would be placed under the supervision of the police for seven years longer. This class would be liable to be summoned to give an account of themselves, and to show that they were not gaining a livelihood by dishonest means. They would also be subject to be apprehended, and, in case the offence were proved against them, they would be sentenced to imprisonment, or if found by any constable in any private or public place under circumstances of suspicion, or if found by any private person on private property, not being able to give a proper account of themselves, they would be subjected to a year's imprisonment. With respect to those sentenced twice previously, it was proposed that they should in all cases receive sentences of seven years' penal servitude, and, after the end of their detention, be subjected to the supervision of the police for the remainder of their lives. He admitted there might be objections to dealing in this manner with "habitual criminals," but he had no doubt a man convicted three times was an "habitual criminal." There was a strong probability that for every detected crime he had committed ten undetected ones. In such cases society was justified in taking vigorous measures of repression. With regard to this class of criminals he thought the law had hitherto been too lenient, and it was time that society should arm itself with more effectual weapons against habitual crime. He had little faith in the moral effect of the ordinary imprisonment of an offender who had been living a life of crime. On the other hand, a long sentence of penal servitude had this effect—it broke up the habits of the criminal, separated him from his old associates, accustomed him to vigorous labour, while means were put within his power of returning to a life of honesty and industry; and, as a matter of fact, those means were frequently and successfully resorted to. He had seen a classification of prisoners made in a pamphlet, published by one who had himself suffered six years' penal servitude for his guilt in a commercial fraud; and which seemed to be trustworthy. That calculation was that 10 per cent of all the prisoners convicted were persons who, under some strong temptation, had fallen into a great crime, and were therefore severely punished, but who were not, nor likely to become "habitual criminals." Of the remaining 90 per cent 40 had no other intention than to return, at the expiration of their sentence, to a life of crime, and were wholly irreclaimable. Of the remaining 50 per cent he believed that most were susceptible of good influences—that they were generally persons of weak wills, not utterly depraved; and that if they fell into good hands they might be reformed. That, he might add, accorded very much with the experience of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society. Now, in such circumstances, what ought the Legislature to do? He was aware of the difficulties to be encountered in dealing with this important question; but it seemed to him that what they ought to aim at was to give encouragement and assistance to the reclaimable, but with respect to the hopelessly irreclaimable to hunt them down without mercy. He did not say that this Bill was the best that could be devised for such a purpose. Our criminal legislation had been tentative and progressive; it had made improvements from time to time, and experience might prove that still greater improvements might be made hereafter. The discussion of this very Bill had led to a large number of suggestions which could not, perhaps, be embodied, in immediate legislation, but were deserving of serious consideration. He would especially refer to a valuable paper on the subject, written by Mr. Henry Taylor, in *Fraser's Magazine*, in which he advocated a life of imprisonment for those criminals who had been shown to be irreclaimable. The remaining provisions of the Bill related to questions of minor importance. It contained stringent provisions against vagrants, and against those who kept lodging-houses, beer-shops, and other places of public entertainment which were the resort of thieves. It was also proposed to deal severely—though he thought not with undue severity—with receivers of stolen goods. Any person previously convicted, before or after the passing of that Act, who should be found in the possession of stolen goods would be presumed to be guilty unless he could show to the contrary. And it was also provided that if any person had been convicted of that offence it should be lawful to prove against him that other stolen goods had been found in his possession. There was also a clause not strictly germane to the Bill, but required by the necessities of the times—one imposing a more severe punishment than could now be assigned for assaults on the police. At present the penalty for an assault on the police was even less than for an assault committed on an ordinary person. The Bill gave power to fix the penalty at six months' imprisonment, with or without hard labour, instead of one month's imprisonment or a fine of £5. These were the principal provisions of the Bill. He believed it to be one—he would not say of pressing necessity or peculiar urgency, but one which would have a most useful effect in diminishing crime throughout the country. The evil of crime was not so much in the direct loss it occasioned, by the plunder committed, as in the fact that the offenders constituted schools of crime in which the young and ignorant were entrapped; and it seemed to him right and just that the Legislature should arm society with the means of repressing those evils. He had been anxious not to carry this repressive legislation further than was strictly necessary, and he was glad to find from the Notices of Amendments which had been given, that those who propounded them were in favour not of narrowing or weakening but of enlarging the principle of the Bill. He moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and he hoped their discussions in Committee would be so businesslike that they would make rapid progress with the measure.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY said, he was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that this Bill was not of pressing urgency, for it seemed to him that its being most urgent was the only justification for pushing it forward for its first discussion just as the House was rising for the holidays.

Mr. BRUCE explained that he had meant to say that it was not more pressing now than it had been for the last ten or twenty years.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY said, it was most necessary before so important a Bill passed into law that it should receive the most ample discussion; yet it was brought forward when three-fourths of the House had left town. It had been said that the other House were reduced to merely recording the decisions of that House; but now the tables were turned, and on the subject of this Bill the House of Commons were asked simply to record the decisions of the House of Lords. Very few of those hon. Members who had the experience necessary for the proper discussion of this question remained, and there could only be a mere semblance of debate. Changes in the criminal law should be made carefully, completely, and, if possible, permanently. This Bill introduced several novel principles into our criminal law and greatly extended and developed old ones. Among the new principles, it gave the police power to arrest a man without warrant on the suspicion that he was not earning an honest livelihood. Another new principle was that in certain cases it threw the onus of proving his innocence upon the accused, while another consisted in a new test of crime which was to be punished as habitual. Among the developments of old principles it made the handing a man over to the surveillance of the police a part of his sentence — not, as heretofore, a condition of suspended punishment. There were only three principles on which punishment could justly rest—the incapacitation of the criminal, the reformation of the criminal, and the deterring from a repetition of the crime. The first was the object of our punishments of hanging and transportation. The main idea in those punishments was to get rid of the criminal. It is the right principle in punishing the incorrigible. But we carried it out too far in secondary punishments to save ourselves from more troublesome treatment. Fortunately, we suffered from that selfish view. Transportation was found to close our colonies against our emigration which was the best remedy for poverty — and poverty was the chief cause of crime. When transportation was no longer available, and it was found necessary to keep our criminals within our own shores, the necessity of reforming our criminals was recognized. In carrying out this principle in punishments, however, two great mistakes were made. In the first place, the new plan was confused with the old idea of putting criminals out of the way, and they were accordingly sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, similar to the old terms of transportation. Upon this point he was at issue with the right hon. Gentleman. He disapproved these long imprisonments, and was horrified to hear the right hon. Gentleman's approval of the opinion of Mr. Henry Taylor, that after a second conviction for felony—and they all knew what slight crimes were included in that category—a man might be imprisoned for the rest of his life. If this idea were carried out a great part of the population would soon be in prison; and this was to be supplemented by a wholesale system of police surveillance, so that another considerable portion would be in a state of out-door imprisonment, tied, as it were, by the leg to the police. Society would be, in fact, mainly divided between warders and wards, and the latter would be a heavy burden maintained by the remaining industry of the country. The next mistake in carrying out the principle of reformatory punishment, was the attempt to educate criminals in prison—a bastard kind of education which would fail of both penal and reformatory effect. All the old reformers of our criminal law, Howard, Bentham, Mackintosh, Romilly, and Peel, kept in view that education should precede punishment, which should be the corrective of violated laws; but the Acts of 1853, 1857, and 1864, under pretence of supplying in prison the education which had been omitted, simply translated to home servitude the system of transportation. If we had, as the right hon. Gentleman stated, a class of "habitual criminals," well-known to the police, the sooner stringent measures were taken to break it up the better. Any mistake, however, in carrying out this intention would only aggravate the evil, because if the Bill were made too stringent it would simply lead to evasion. Let them fairly try the principle of supervision by drawing a distinction between imprisonment and tutelage. If kindness was the idea of supervision in the process, let it be done by instruments of kindness, and not by the officers of punishment. The first change to be made in the Bill was to take the supervision of criminals who were let out of prison from the police and intrust it to the benevolent societies which devoted their efforts to this special purpose, and could and did carry it out much more successfully. The proper supervision was not that which would be exercised by the police, who would only watch the occasion when they should cleverly lay hold upon a man that they might put him in prison directly he went wrong again, but a supervision which helped him out of the way of prison and police, and enabled him to find for himself an honest livelihood. The criminal class looked upon the police as their natural foes, while the police regarded them as their natural prey. He did not believe in the right hon. Gentleman's 40 per cent of incurable criminals. The Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies, at an extremely small outlay, had got 90 per cent on their discharge into employment. He was acquainted with two of these societies, and from his experience of Birmingham and of Staffordshire, he felt convinced that the right hon. Gentleman's was a darker view than need be taken. These societies, by an Act which he was the means of passing, were enabled to draw upon the county rates to the extent of £2 a man, yet even this limited sum exceeded four-fold the requirements of the Staffordshire Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society which had to do with the "black country," notoriously one of the most criminal districts of the kingdom. The only drawback was that these societies were not sufficiently numerous to provide for the whole country at present; but where they existed the Bill might give power to the chairmen of quarter sessions to commit prisoners on their discharge to their care. The Chief Commissioner of the Police in London was aware of the use of these societies, and by a memorandum of March 5, he proposed to avail himself to the utmost of their services. But the memorandum of the Chief Commissioner put the cart before the horse. He put discharged prisoners into the hands of the police in the first instance, who were to hand them over to the society afterwards, whereas the process should be reversed, and the society should hand over a discharged prisoner to the police only when they were unable to get him to take to honest employment. His only fear was lest the use of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies by the Government might be injurious to the action of the societies themselves. The difference between London and the country was however great, and it appeared that in the metropolis a special class of the police—men selected for tact and judgment — were employed for the purposes of supervision, while in the country no such class could be set apart; and the prisoners under supervision might suffer from the country police what could not occur in London. He feared that this scheme of supervision was too closely drawn from the experience of Ireland, where there was not the same class of thieves, possibly not the same plunder to prey upon. On the other hand there was in Ireland a better organization of police, and it was easy to carry out the registration of their criminals with the aid of the police centre in Dublin. With regard to Clauses 9 and 10, the main principle in the cases they referred to should be that of deterrence by fear of pain. There was no better motive to appeal to. For the reformation of such offenders they must no longer look to prisons but to the coarser and more bitter medium suited to the disease, if they reasonably sought a cure. In Clauses 9 and 10, however, as drawn, the repetition of the principle of deterring from crime was carried out to an outrageous extent, which was certain to defeat itself, for they provided that every man who had been twice convicted should undergo seven years' police supervision in addition to his sentence. Major Fulford, the governor of Stafford County Prison, put to him the case of a lad who had been convicted of some small theft under the Summary Felony Act, and who, through some accident of drink, might be convicted of something else before he arrived at years of discretion. He might afterwards go to work steadily and marry. Major Fulford says—

> "Such a man is not a thief professionally, and would do well if let alone. But by Clause 9 he is to be made liable at all hours for seven years to be harassed by a policeman, and doubtless in some cases goaded into offending, when, of course, the policeman's word would be good against his."

MR. BRUCE: The supervision would be of that special character which is provided by the clause itself.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, the fact stated by the right hon. Gentleman did not remove his objection to the clause. Then, under Clause 10, every person convicted for the third time must be sentenced to seven years' penal servitude and to supervision for the rest of his life. Now, a felony might be anything, from murder to taking an apple off the ground. The Recorder of Birmingham had pointed out that at quarter sessions, where minor offences were tried, the chairman would be compelled to sentence many prisoners, for a very light offence under such circumstances, to seven years' penal servitude. "The schedule of crimes," he added—

> "Is most confused, grouping large and small together, and omitting graver offences, such as embezzlement."

In fact the terms felony and misdemeanour require re-definition. The Recorder said that if this Bill had been law sixty-one prisoners would have been sentenced to seven years' penal servitude last year in Birmingham alone, and 3,570 in the whole of England during the same time. Fixing a minimum rate of punishment by law, instead of leading to uniformity, had always led to evasion. With regard to clause 14, he must say that there the deterrent principle had been deserted just where it was wanted. The sole test of a punishment was whether it was likely to put a stop to the repetition of the crime. Judged by this test they ought, by all experience, to introduce some amount of corporal punishment for stopping the brutal assaults committed by men whose very acts showed them capable of no other check. His own Act for flogging garrotters had signally succeeded, and dispersed the arguments used against it. Major Fulford, in a paper on this subject, said—

> "Clause 14 will not stop a single offence in the way of brutal assaults. This class sees no terror in imprisonment. Now is the time for insisting on all persons convicted of brutal assaults, or with knives, being whipped. What higher motives than fear of pain have you for men who half kill their wives and jump on the bellies of policemen, and on the smallest provocation use their knives, which is becoming more common every day? *The Times* police reports contain three or four brutal assaults on policemen daily. In France such assaults are never heard of."

The root of most of the crime that filled our gaols was the habitual drunkenness and disorderly conduct by which men got sent to gaol for the twentieth and even fiftieth time. When they were wearied of drunkenness and crime they went willingly back to prison, for "there the weary were at rest." The treatment of these men bred a general contempt for the law. He agreed that some such Bill as the present was necessary to break up bands of "habitual criminals," but two essential improvements were necessary in it—one that the use of the police in supervision should be postponed until after the action of the Prisoners' Aid Societies failed, and the other was the greater adoption of the deterrent principle in Clauses 9 and 10, and making the law more efficacious in cases where corporal punishment alone would appeal to the motives of criminals wholly brutalized. With these remarks he would not move the Amendment which stood in his name for referring the Bill to a Select Committee for the purpose of substituting a Discharged Prisoners' Aid Agency throughout the kingdom, to which, instead of the police, the supervision of certain criminals might be intrusted, but would consent to the Bill going at once into Committee, when he hoped to introduce some Amendments now, reserving other points for another Session.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he was very anxious to go into Committee on the Bill, and thought it would be better to discuss the points raised by his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Adderley) when they came to the clauses. The main object of the Bill was to get some unity of inspection of "habitual criminals" throughout the country. He was glad they were not legislating on this subject under the pressure of any panic, but after full consideration and additional experience of the existence of a class of "habitual criminals." His right hon. Friend said that the Bill would introduce novelties into their legislation, but he could not quite agree with his right hon. Friend upon that point. The supervision of license-holders had been in existence for some time, and the Bill would only carry it further to those who belonged to the class of "habitual criminals," and who went on living in a course of crime. Objections had been made to the clause throwing the proof of innocence on the accused; but it should be remembered that the system had long been applied in various branches of industry in the North of England, as, for example, in the case of those employed in the worsted, silk, and other manufactures. Persons found in the possession of property called "waste" were obliged to show how they came into possession of it; and after 6 o'clock in the evening any person found carrying "waste," even in the public thoroughfares, could be called upon to prove where he got it, and in default was liable to a penalty of £20, and a long term of imprisonment. The present Bill was only an extension of that principle. No one was more ready than himself to acknowledge with gratitude the services of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies, but his right hon. Friend himself admitted that they did not exist in sufficient numbers in the country to enable the House to hand over to them the care of discharged criminals. They were volunteer societies, and they could not be created by an Act of Parliament. The moment you gave them the character of a Department of the State they would lose all their energy and efficiency. It was the energy and earnestness of men like his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Adderley) which gave to these societies their value. Where they existed he had no doubt the police would be only too glad to make use of them. The fact was that the police wished to be relieved from the surveillance of discharged prisoners and to know that they were getting their living in an honest career. As long as the license-holders were getting on well they never went near to annoy them or to give information about them, but were ready to assist them in getting work. There was a good deal of force in the objection raised by his right hon. Friend to the clause which subjected men to seven years' penal servitude, and he should also be glad to assist him in doing anything in reason to prevent those brutal assaults on the police which were at present so frequent.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that he had done all he could to dissuade the House, some years ago, from sanctioning the abandonment of transportation, that best of secondary punishments, that most effective process of reformation. He then foresaw that the necessity for arbitrary measures of internal administration must arise from the aggregation of discharged convicts in this country. He had known many instances in which convicts had been unable to get employment, and had found the doors of society shut against them, and he looked with great suspicion upon a measure which would deprive these criminals of the primary right of every Englishman that he should be held to be innocent until he had been proved guilty. He consequently deprecated this great anti-constitutional change in the fundamental law of this country. By this attempt to ostracize those who had more than once lapsed into offences, many of which were not of a serious description; to create out of these an element—a separate, in fact, a servile class—would in time produce a state of feeling the reverse of satisfactory. Parliament would run the risk of changing the temper of large bodies of their fellow-countrymen towards the law and its administration. At this advanced period of the Session the measure, if passed at all, ought to be limited, he thought, to the very smallest amount of change.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, that while agreeing with most of what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles Adderley) he disagreed with the proposition that the only test of punishment was whether it was or was not an adequate means of suppressing crime. He believed it was quite possible to invent a punishment which would put down a crime, yet at the same time demoralize a community. The administration of the criminal law was one great instrument of moral instruction, and the moment any principle was adopted which had a tendency to lower the moral tone of the community a mischief was done which far exceeded in importance the advantage gained in the suppression of individual crimes; and anything vindictive in the administration of the law, or anything degrading in the punishment inflicted, had a tendency, he maintained, to lower this moral tone. There was a great deal to be said in favour of the present measure; but he thought it was in very strong contrast with former portions of our criminal legislation. Happily, it was not pressed forward now under any sense of panic, though when first suggested and introduced something very like a panic prevailed on the subject of crimes accompanied with violence. But what were the facts? By the official Returns, extending from the years 1863 to 1867, it appeared that a steady diminution was occurring. Offences against the person had diminished 18 per cent between those years; offences against property accompanied with violence had diminished 11 per cent; offences against property without violence had diminished 5 per cent; forgery and offences against the currency had diminished 21 per cent; burglary, house and shop-breaking, and attempts to commit those offences had diminished 13 per cent; robberies by persons armed and in company, and simple robberies had diminished 10 per cent; and larcenies to the amount of £5 from a dwelling-house, larcenies from the person, larceny by servants, and simple larcenies had diminished 5 per cent. The significance of these statistics was increased when it was remembered that this diminution of crime, actual, though not very large under all those heads, had occurred in the face of a constant increase of population, and during several years of great trade depression, when a very large portion of the community in London was thrown out of employment and left to depend either upon the public rates or upon plunder for subsistence. Hence, although some measure, passed in a spirit of moderation, might be desirable for dealing with criminals, there was nothing at present in the shape of enormous increase of crime calling for the application of extraordinary remedies. He had taken some pains to ascertain the actual state of things with regard to those whom the Bill called "habitual criminals." He found that the total commitments in Middlesex in 1867, male and female, were 23,431; of these 1 in every 5½ had been committed once previously; 1 in every 15 had been committed twice before; 1 in every 37 three times; 1 in every 43 four times; and 1 in every 70 five times previously. So far there had been a rapid falling off, but now there was an equally rapid rise again. One in every 55 had been committed six or seven times previously; 1 in every 60 had been committed eight or nine times previously; and 1 in every 27 had been committed upwards of ten times. The House would be surprised to learn that the turning point in these different ratios was due to the commitals of women. In Middlesex there was, unfortunately, a very large depraved class; these women were continually getting drunk or committing assaults, and for these offences they spent half their time in gaol, and so swelled up the figures rapidly. But such items ought really to be left out of the calculation when they were considering whether these Returns furnished any justification for so strong a measure as that now before the Legislature. For the reasons which he had just given, he entertained very grave doubts as to the necessity or propriety of such powers as were given by this Bill; but, recommended as it was by Her Majesty's Government, he did not feel justified in resisting it. To the 10th clause, however, that which obliged the Judge to inflict a sentence of seven years' penal servitude for the third conviction, he was decidedly opposed. Many cases would suggest themselves where this would be attended with very great hardship. A boy, for instance, stole a bun; some years afterwards he stole a red herring; and, finally, two years later, he stole a piece of cheese. Could it be seriously proposed that for this third offence he was to suffer seven years' penal servitude? If so, the character of the administration of justice would be gone; the jury would shudder at the consequences of their own verdict, and on the very next occasion would deprive the Judge of the opportunity of passing a sentence which they believed to be extreme. Anybody familar with the practice of our criminal courts could tell very well what would happen. The counsel for the prisoner would be sure to acquaint the jury with the minimum punishment that could be inflicted on the prisoner if they found him guilty, and the jury in the teeth of the facts, would thereupon acquit him. It was not a very logical, nor yet a satisfactory proceeding; but such was the rough mode in which, by means of our judicial process, and the feelings with which juries were animated, legislation was corrected that went beyond what equity required.

MR. HENLEY said, the Secretary of State for the Home Department could not be surprised if considerable discussion arose upon this measure. Upon the second reading of the Bill the right hon. Gentleman postponed his statement, and since then he has circulated a Paper containing Amendments which enlarged the scope of the Bill ten-fold. As the measure came down from the House of Lords its operation was confined to this country, but the Amendments extended it to Ireland and Scotland. Moreover, the provisions of the Bill were originally limited to license-holders—that was to say to persons who had been convicted and sentenced to penal servitude; but they were now applied to all persons who, having once been convicted of felony, were again convicted, without reference to the period of time that might have elapsed, or to the nature of the felony of which the person might originally have been convicted. The Bill had now attained dimensions rendering it impossible to say to what number of persons it would probably apply. On this point the right hon. Gentleman himself had given no information; his speech was confined to license-holders and persons sentenced to penal servitude. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that 50 per cent of the existing license-holders were irreclaimable——

MR. BRUCE: No; that 10 per cent were beyond all suspicion, and that of the remaining 90 per cent 40 were irreclaimable.

MR. HENLEY: As to those that were irreclaimable, he said his object was to "hunt them down." But had the right hon. Gentleman considered with what risk this process was attended, and how many of those who would otherwise be reclaimable he would drive into the ranks of the irreclaimable while engaged in this process of hunting down? Look at the magnitude of this question. The hunting-down system was to be brought to bear on reclaimable and irreclaimable alike, for the police could make no distinction. He should have looked with apprehension on the principle as applied to license-holders simply; but when it was extended to all persons convicted of felony, what chance had they of escaping from the terrible position in which they were placed? In this country, where the struggle for existence was so great, it was enormously difficult at best for a person once tainted with crime to find means of gaining an honest livelihood. How vastly those difficulties must be increased by the operation of this Bill! As to the clause in the Bill naming a fixed sentence of seven years' penal servitude, he thought it a very great mistake. He was old enough to recollect the time when the capital punishment for horse-stealing being done away with, the punishment substituted was transportation for life without power of abatement. What happened? The Judges who charged the grand juries made all sorts of suggestions to them about finding bills for receiving instead of stealing, knowing that if the man was convicted of stealing they would be obliged to pronounce a sentence which, under the circumstances, perhaps they felt to be unjust. He recollected this as well as if it had only occurred yesterday; all sorts of suggestions were made with regard to proof and the sufficiency of evidence, as to which previously there had never been a doubt. That was the way in which extreme legislation always defeated itself. Difficulties were raised, and passed on from Judges to jurors, and so to all parties concerned; and the end was that instead of persons being convicted and undergoing a reasonable punishment, great numbers were acquitted and received no punishment at all. This Bill introduced several new and objectionable principles; of which not the least objectionable was that persons would in future be punished on suspicion, and not on proof. The Bill was introduced by a Liberal Government, and he was sorry for it; for he believed that if the principle that a man was to be convicted not upon facts proved, but upon what was called reasonable suspicion were once adopted it might soon get a pretty wide extent, and the first principle of justice would be broken down and destroyed. What proof had been given to the House that this system of police supervision had been attended with advantage in the countries where it had been long practised? He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman could bring forward any such proof. On the contrary, the evidence which was given before a Committee on the subject of Transportation some sixteen or seventeen years ago left upon his mind the impression that no advantage resulted from this system of supervision. He could hardly conceive a more extravagant power than that which it was proposed to put into the hands of the police. "It is not every man who is born a huntsman," and catching thieves was a particular trade. Accordingly, to give to men who had no natural aptitude for it all those extraordinary powers was a proceeding of very doubtful wisdom. Thieves knew the police quite as well as they knew the thieves; and the result of the new system, he feared, would be to diminish rather than to stimulate the repression of crime. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the great number of criminals in London; but he (Mr. Henley) had carried away from a perusal of the judicial statistics the impression that, for every policeman in London there were a man, a woman, and a small boy—surely not an extravagant number for them to watch. He fully agreed with his right hon. Friend (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) as to the value of reformational efforts after the criminals were turned loose, and he greatly wished that system could be extended. He did not, however, agree with another right hon. Friend as to the more frequent use of the lash, and did not believe it would have the effect anticipated. Neither did he see the advantage of the power proposed to be conferred on the magistrates; for, without any reflection upon them, he thought that, in cases of assaults upon the police especially, persons accused were more certain of an impartial trial before a jury. He greatly regretted that a measure of such great importance as this Bill should be pressed at the end of the Session, when very few Members were in town, and with such important Amendments proposed to be introduced as those to which he had called attention. By one of these Amendments the expenses, instead of being defrayed by the public purse, as proposed when the Bill left the House of Lords, were to be thrown upon the local rates. He hardly thought that a fair proposal to make at this late period of the Session.

SIR GEORGE JENKINSON said, he thought the Bill a very valuable one, and he hoped they would now go into Committee, when any objections to it which were capable of being urged might be removed.

MR. HADFIELD said, he objected to the Bill as a departure from the more humane tendencies of the criminal legislation of recent years. Our criminal jurisprudence had been too severe; it was not framed on the principles of mercy, or with the object of reclaiming offenders. The late Governor of Wakefield Gaol supported this view. He believed that the principles of the Bill were repugnant to the English people, and he wished some one would move its rejection, that he might have the satisfaction of voting against it.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *struck out.*

Clauses 2 and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Power to apprehend holders of license on suspicion).

MR. STAPLETON moved in page 2, line 1, to leave out "and whom he suspects of getting a livelihood by dishonest means." He should move at the end of sub-section 1, to insert—

> "And any chief officer of police having reason to believe that any convict who is the holder of any such license as aforesaid is getting a livelihood by dishonest means may authorize any constable or police officer, in writing, to take such convict into custody and bring him before a justice of the peace or other competent magistrate as aforesaid."

The word "suspects" carried us back to the very worst times of the French Revolution; whereas the substituted words of his Amendment "has reason to believe" were taken from an Act brought in by Lord Campbell when Lord Chief Justice. [Mr. BRUCE intimated that there would be no objection on the part of the Government to abandon the word "suspects."] He also desired to throw the responsibility of the arrest on the chief officer of the police force instead of leaving it to the rank and file.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought that the words "has reason to believe" would be preferable to the word "suspects."

MR. BRUCE said, he had no objection to the change suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Gathorne Hardy). He was extremely anxious that this Bill should have the good opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley); and therefore he wished to relieve that right hon. Gentleman's mind of all apprehension of dangerous consequences being likely to result from it. He had obtained from the Chief Commissioner of Police a Return of the number of license-holders in the metropolis. While the metropolis contained one-seventh of the whole population of England and Wales, it contained a larger proportion of the criminal population of the whole kingdom. The number of persons at present holding licenses was 2,000; and yet it appeared, from a document furnished to him by the Chief Commissioner of Police, that the number of license-holders whom the metropolitan police could lay hands upon under this Bill was only twelve.

MR. HENLEY observed that he had said very little about license-holders. As they were persons at large before the expiration of their sentences, there would be no reason to complain of their being under the surveillance of the police.

MR. BRUCE said, he hoped to be able, at the proper time, to convince his right hon. Friend that in the case of persons who had already sustained long periods of imprisonment there would be no grievance any more than in that of the license-holders.

MR. STAPLETON withdrew his Amendment, and moved to leave out "suspects of," and insert "has reason to believe to be."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. BRUCE *moved,* in lines 2 and 3, to leave out "a justice of the peace or other competent magistrate," and insert "two or more justices of the peace or a stipendiary magistrate."

MR. M'MAHON moved after "if," to insert "it shall appear from the facts proved before such justices or magistrate that there are reasonable grounds for such belief." As the clause stood the magistrate would have no discretion if the holder of the license were not able to give negative evidence.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON proposed in page 2, line 14 at end of clause, to add "or if such justice or magistrate prefers not to assume the responsibility of so acting he may commit such holder of a license for trial at the next quarter sessions, there to be dealt with as above provided." He feared that some magistrates sitting alone would hesitate to take upon themselves the responsibility of acting on the clause as it stood.

Mr. BRUCE said, he thought that after the alterations made in the clause the Amendment was unnecessary.

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON said, he would not press the Amendment against the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman. As a justice he should not hesitate to act on the clause himself. He had seen in *The Times* an account of a man who some years ago was convicted of burglary and murder, and sentenced to be hung. Through the kindness of some Home Secretary the sentence was commuted, the convict was sent to one of the colonies, and at the end of four years received a ticket-of-leave available only for the colony. He returned, however, to this country, and after going on well for some time got again into the hands of the police. Now, he could not think it a hardship on a man like that to be under the surveillance of the police.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5 (Penalty for breach of conditions of license).

Mr. BRUCE, in moving a verbal Amendment, said, he believed that the supervision of the police was most useful to the convicts themselves. These persons had themselves borne testimony to the delicacy and kindness of the police. He had received a communication from the Chief Director of Prisons which stated that in 475 cases of revoked licenses there had been only six in which the license-holders complained, and only two in which they had alleged oppression on the part of the police. Again, he was informed that out of 3,000 cases which had come before the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society there were only two in which the parties said they had been oppressed by the police. Besides, this clause would get rid of that which license-holders had complained of as harassing and vexatious, and as operating so as to prevent their obtaining and retaining employment. He alluded to the requirement that license-holders should report themselves monthly to the police.

Mr. BOUVERIE pointed out that under the clause license-holders could be punished for breaches of conditions inserted in the license by the Secretary of State without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. BRUCE said, he would, at a subsequent stage, introduce words providing that all conditions inserted in licenses by the Secretary of State should be laid before Parliament.

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 6 (Register of holders of licenses).

Mr. BRUCE said, that by this clause, as he proposed to amend it, provision would be made for the registration of criminals. At present it might, and frequently did, happen that a person who had been convicted of six, eight, or ten felonies was put on his trial for another offence, and was tried and convicted without the Court being aware of the previous convictions. This was very likely to happen in the case of tramps who had been convicted in different counties. If this clause were agreed to there would be a complete register of criminals—that was, criminals convicted of the graver classes of offence. As the clause stood the register would only include holders of licenses. The right hon. Gentleman then moved in lines 25 and 26, to leave out from "convicts" to "them," in line 27, both inclusive, and insert "criminals."

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought that, owing to the imperfection of our classification of crime, the proposed register would not be a very reliable record in respect to the real character of the offences. To pick up from under a tree and carry away a half-rotten apple was felony; so that the name of a person who had been convicted of that offence would be recorded on the register as that of a person who had been convicted of "felony." He believed that the want of information in the case of previous convictions was owing in a very great degree to the parsimony of the Treasury in cutting down the expenses of gaol officials coming to give evidence on such points.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought that in the interpretation clause the "criminals" to be registered might be described as persons who had been convicted of crimes set out in the Schedule of the Bill.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY asked whether persons convicted of assaults would not be registered. He thought it would be well to include them?

MR. BRUCE said, they could not extend the registration to assaults. He agreed with his right hon. Friend that it was an anomaly to have an offence like that of picking up an apple classed with the heinous crimes which were also included under the head "felony;" but he was afraid that if Parliament held its hands in the matter of registering criminals till we had a proper classification of offences the community would suffer severely. He thought that Parliament would feel itself obliged to leave to the Executive the regulation of details like that of registration.

MR. BOUVERIE asked if there was to be a register kept of every person that committed any kind of misdemeanour?

MR. BRUCE said, he would consider the question whether words might not be introduced which would more accurately define the system of registration.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 7 (Returns for purposes of register).

MR. BRUCE proposed, after line 42, to add as a separate paragraph—

> "All expenses incurred in any place in carrying this section into effect with the sanction of the authority authorized to allow charges on the funds for the maintenance of the police in that place, shall be deemed to be part of the expenses of such police, and be defrayed accordingly."

MR. HENLEY said, that notice of this Amendment had been given only two days ago. The expenses to which the Amendment related ought not to be very large; but the principle involved in the Amendment was an important one, and it ought not to be adopted at a period when there was not time for its consideration. As the register was for the benefit of the country at large, and as London would derive more advantage from it than any other place, the Returns ought not to be a charge on local funds, but ought to be paid for out of moneys provided by Parliament.

MR. BRUCE said, that as there was a contribution of one-fourth towards the police in the counties and boroughs, the cost of the Returns would not be thrown entirely on local funds. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) that the Returns ought not to cost much; but the way to secure economy in the matter was to make the charge in the main a local one.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Person twice guilty of felony and not punished with penal servitude to be subject to the supervision of the police).

MR. BRUCE said, he was anxious to meet the objections that had been raised to this clause, and to mitigate its stringent severity in the cases of boys or young persons who might have committed two very trivial offences which, under the present law, were regarded as felonies. He therefore proposed to insert the following words after the word "not" in line 19:—

> "Unless the court by or before whom he is tried, for special reasons to be stated by the court, declares that a less punishment is to be awarded to him."

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, the object of the right hon. Gentleman might be more simply secured by the insertion of the words "unless otherwise declared by the court," in place of "whether so declared by the court or not."

MR. BRUCE accepted the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, and withdrew his own Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. GATHORNE HARDY *moved* to insert the words after "seven years," "or such less period as the court shall direct."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY asked, whether the previous convictions must have taken place before a court of quarter sessions?

MR. BRUCE answered in the affirmative.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Person thrice convicted of felony to be liable to be taken up if found under suspicious circumstances).

Mr. BRUCE said, great objection had been taken to this clause, and undoubtedly great hardship might result from it. He would, therefore, suggest to the Committee to consider whether they would give the Judge the power to remit the sentence of seven years' penal servitude, or whether they would omit the portion of the clause relating to it. A Judge already had power to inflict a sentence of seven years.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT said, he thought it would be better to leave this part of the clause as it stood.

Mr. COLLINS thought the retention of the words would indicate the intention of the Legislature that this sentence should be the rule and not the exception.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS moved the omission of the first part of the clause down to the words "seven years."

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON said, he hoped the words would not be struck out, because they would do something to produce uniformity in sentences.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, that if this fearful sentence were absolutely imperative, it would be a powerful argument with counsel in addressing the jury against conviction.

Mr. DICKINSON said, the sentence depended on a third conviction. After conviction, as a matter of form, the two previous convictions would be proved, and therefore the matter would not be brought before the jury.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he thought it most desirable that the words should be omitted. There would be many cases where, even in the case of a third conviction, seven years would be too severe a sentence.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 11. (Amendment of sect. 4 of the Vagrant Act, 5 Geo. 4, c. 83).

Mr. STAPLETON opposed the clause.

Mr. BRUCE said, the object of the clause was to remove a difficulty with respect to a class of persons who were reputed to be thieves, and were well known to the police. They were watched by the police; they were seen going about attempting to pick pockets; there was no moral doubt of their intention to commit crime; and yet, unless they were taken in the act of attempting to pick a pocket or commit a theft, the magistrate had no power to inflict punishment. The intention of this clause was to give the magistrates more summary powers than they at present possessed. The cases contemplated by the clause arose mainly in the towns, and would for the most part come before stipendiary magistrates.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, that the clause in effect provided that a person reputed to be a thief might be convicted without evidence; no act or acts were to be proved at all.

Mr. HENLEY said, the wording of the clause was a matter of considerable importance, for the phraseology would be looked to by magistrates convicting persons under the preceding sections of the Bill. The clause spoke of the "general circumstances of the case," and he should like to know what they could be if they did not include the acts of the person. It could not be meant that a man was to be convicted of a substantive offence on account of his character; in an ordinary way a person was not convicted unless there was proof of an act which led to a presumption of guilt.

Mr. BRUCE said, there had been cases in which a person had been seen to put his hand into the pocket of another, and yet, because he abstracted nothing, and theft was not completed, the magistrate could not convict.

Mr. COLLINS said, the object aimed at was to shift the burden of proof in some cases. Instead of speaking of the "known character" of a man, he would say a person "previously convicted," and with that Amendment the clause would be a valuable addition to the Bill.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, it was impossible to define the acts which should induce a magistrate to believe that a man intended to commit felony. The words must be general, and the magistrate must be left to form a judgment from the circumstances of the case. It would be an improvement to say that a man should have been already convicted instead of speaking of his known character. He would suggest the omission of the word "general" before the word "circumstances."

Dr. BREWER said, that both pickpockets and shoplifters often went in gangs, and that increased the difficulty of obtaining convictions.

Mr. BRUCE assented to the Amendment to leave out "general" before "circumstances."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Penalty for harbouring thieves &c.; 25 & 26 Vict. c. 101, s. 337).

Mr. DIMSDALE said, he wished to call attention to the necessity of inserting words to amend the law relating to night houses, so that such houses should be deemed disorderly without the necessity of proving that women were found entering or going out of them with men. He moved, in line 7, after "thieves," to leave out "or," and he would move, after "reputed thieves," to insert "or prostitutes."

Mr. BRUCE said, he could assure the hon. Member that the proposed Amendment would not carry out his object; and he must point out that the subject the hon. Member proposed to deal with did not come within the province of the Bill.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Burden of proof in cases of receiving stolen goods).

Mr. AMPHLETT said, he thought a hardship would be inflicted if a person who had once been convicted were in all future time compelled to prove his innocence if charged with receiving stolen goods. He moved, in page 7, line 1, after "is," to insert "within five years of the termination of the period of punishment awarded on such previous conviction."

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he would not object to the clause, if prisoners were enabled to give evidence on their own behalf on oath.

Mr. AMPHLETT said, he would withdraw his Amendment if the right hon. Gentleman (the Secretary of State for the Home Department) would consider it on the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND (Mr. G. Young) proposed that in case of a person charged with receiving stolen property, "evidence of such previous conviction shall be admissible as evidence of his knowledge that such goods had been stolen," leaving it to him to prove the contrary.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. STAPLETON said, he wished to introduce words giving the same power to the police to search for stolen goods as they had to search for obscene prints; but rendering it unnecessary for them previously to go to a magistrate for a warrant to search. He begged to move, in line 19, after "him," to insert—

"Any constable or police officer may, if authorized so to do in writing by a chief officer of police, enter any house, shop, warehouse, yard, or other premises in search of stolen goods, and make such search, and seize and secure any property he may believe to have been stolen, in such manner as he would be authorized to do if he had a search warrant, and the property seized, if any, corresponded to the property described in such search warrant: Provided, That in every case in which any property is seized, the person on whose premises it was at the time of seizure, or the person from whom it was taken if other than the person on whose premises it was, shall, unless previously charged with receiving the same knowing it to have been stolen, be summoned within three days before a justice of the peace, or other competent magistrate to account for his possession of such property and such justice or other magistrate shall make such order respecting the disposal of such property as the justice of the case may require; and it shall be lawful for any chief officer of police to give such authority as aforesaid in the following cases:—

"First, When such premises are at, or have been within eighteen months of, the time of such search in the occupation of any person who has been convicted of receiving stolen property or of harbouring thieves.

"Second. When such premises are at the time of such search in the occupation of any person who has been convicted of any offence involving fraud or dishonesty, and punishable by penal servitude or imprisonment.

"And it shall not be necessary for such chief officer of police in giving such authority to specify any particular property, but he may give such authority if he has reason to believe generally that such premises are being made a receptacle for stolen goods."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 *agreed to.*

Clause 15 *struck out.*

Clauses 16 and 17 *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.—THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he owed an apology to the hon. Member for the City (Mr. Crawford) for not being in his place yesterday. He had intended to call attention to the proposal to borrow money from others than the Bank of England, but was too late yesterday to do so from an oversight.

Bill read the third time and *passed.*

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 5th August, 1869.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod. [No. 278.]

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; East India Loan* (267); Inclosure of Lands* (270); Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* (272); Dividends on Public Stocks* (269); Harbour of Galle Loan* (268); Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* (273); Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* (271); Creditors Sequestrations* (275).

Second Reading—Adjutants (Jury) Exemption* (75); Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham)* (186); Expiring Laws Continuance* (262); Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* (266); Accounts, &c. Presentation* (253).

Committee — Seeds Adulteration (242 - 276); Nitro Glycerine* (245); Railways Abandonment* (249).

Committee—Report—Telegraphs* (243); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment* (256); Public Works (Ireland)* (255); Clerks of Assize* (248); Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul)* (246); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (251); Basses Lights, Ceylon,* (254); Criminal Lunatics* (247); Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (249); Militia Pay*; Militia (Ireland)* (252); Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* (257); Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment* (232).

Third Reading—Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds* (215); Fisheries (Ireland)* (236); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (230); Land Tax Commissioners Names* (158); Dublin Freemen Commission (210), and *passed.*

SEEDS ADULTERATION BILL—(No. 242.)

(*The Earl of Devon.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, he had given notice of some Amendments which, while not affecting the principle of the measure, would mitigate the penalties to be imposed for killing and dyeing seeds. He had also received communications stating that inconvenience would arise from fixing an early date for the operation of the Act, there being on the Continent a practice of drying seeds in order to give them a better appearance rather than for purposes of fraud, and there being large stocks of these on hand, while but little notice had been given of the Bill.

The Earl of DEVON said, he was ready to accept the Amendments of his noble Friend; but, at the same time, begged to remind him that the operation of the Bill had already been deferred from the 1st of October to the 1st of May.

House in Committee accordingly; Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow,* and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 276.)

BANKRUPTCY BILL—(No. 265.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments *considered.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR *moved,* "That the House agree to the Commons' Amendments made to the Lords' Amendments, and not to insist on the Lords' Amendments, to which the Commons have disagreed." The Commons had adopted all their Lordships' Amendments, which occupied twelve pages, with the exception of two. One of these related to companies, which their Lordships thought should not be adjudged bankrupt. It had been found that there might be an easy means of avoiding bankruptcy in such cases, and the Commons had therefore adhered to their original proposal. The other left the appointment of the committee of inspection optional. With regard to non-traders, the Bill originally exposed them to the consequences of bankruptcy to a greater extent than the existing law; but the Select Committee of this House, while amending this, went further, and diminished their present liability. The Commons now proposed to continue the existing liability, neither widening nor contracting it.

On Question? *agreed to.*

DUBLIN FREEMEN COMMISSION BILL.

(No. 189.) THIRD READING.

(*The Lord Lurgan.*)

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Lurgan*).

The Earl of LONGFORD said, he had received so many representations with regard to the policy of the measure and the manner in which it had been brought before Parliament that he felt bound to take the opinion of their Lordships upon it, having given notice to the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) that he should do so. As he remarked on the former occasion, the Bill had the appearance of being the persecution of a political interest, and he saw no reason, at the present moment, for altering that opinion. This, indeed, was the third attack on the Dublin freemen. The first, founded on a Report which the Judge who tried the petition had not made, was abandoned. The second was a bold proposal to disfranchise a large portion of the constituency of Dublin without investigation; and this also fell to the ground. The third was this proposal for a special inquiry. The Government disclaimed any party motive in promoting the scheme, seeing in it purity of election, exactly as they saw justice, generosity, and peace in a measure which had now unhappily become law; but those who were not its members or supporters could not fail to perceive a disposition to disfranchise or throw discredit on a supposed Conservative element in the constituency of Dublin, with a view to a more favourable Liberal result at future elections. At this period of the Session, when the attendance of Peers was declining, days were of importance in the arrangement of the Business of the House, and he could not but remark that while on the 22nd of July this and two other Bills — the Savings Banks Bill and the Married Women's Property Bill—were brought up from the Commons and printed on the following day, the second reading of those two Bills was proceeded with on the 29th and 30th; whereas it was not till the 30th that notice was given of the second reading of this measure on the 2nd of August. He had little doubt that had that stage been fixed for the 29th or 30th of July the House would not have been troubled with any discussion upon the third reading. The delay might possibly have been accidental; if so, it was an unfortunate accident; while if it arose from management, the aspect of the matter was still more unfavourable. He repudiated the imputation of shielding electoral corruption; but he saw no reason for going beyond the limits of the Corrupt Practices Act of last Session. Regarding the measure as an act of oppression and as overbearing conduct on the part of the strong towards the weak, he moved to defer the third reading for three months.

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months.")—(*The Earl of Longford.*)

Earl GRANVILLE said, he did not rise to discuss the merits of the Bill, which had been found in "another place" to be the only way of dealing with a question which originated with the Report of the Judge, but to remind their Lordships of what passed on Tuesday night in this House. The noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) having moved that the House should go into Committee that day three months, he appealed to him to withdraw the Amendment on the ground that there had been two divisions on the previous night, and that no notice had been given of the Amendment. An intimation had been given by a noble Earl on the opposite side, who had some authority to give such an intimation (the Earl of Malmesbury), that there would be no further opposition to the Bill. He (Earl Granville) was backed up in that appeal by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), the Leader of the party opposite, whose words, as reported in *The Times*, which he thought stated exactly what fell from him, were these—

> "Lord Cairns thought the merits of the Bill were fairly challenged last night. The majority was not a very large one; but at this period of the Session it would hardly be right to divide again on the same question, and he hoped his noble Friend would not persevere with his Amendment, particularly as no notice had been given of it."

The noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) thereupon withdrew his opposition, without giving the slightest intimation of his intention to renew it at a further stage. His noble Friend Lord Bessborough, on the strength of what had occurred, was not now present, and he believed several other noble Lords were also absent. Lord Lyveden, indeed, put the question to himself whether it was necessary for him to wait in town over to-night and support the Government in regard to this Bill, and his reply was that it was not at all necessary. Now, he did not deny that the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had a right to make this Motion; but he thought noble Lords opposite would feel that it would very much embarrass the future conduct of the House if it were pressed and carried. He ventured to appeal to the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury), who was not present on Tuesday, and he was sure that, had the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) been in his place, he would confirm all that he had stated.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that, although he formerly occupied such a position as to have a certain degree of influence over noble Lords on his own side of the House, he must decline at this moment to assume any responsibility of that nature. He could only act for himself; and, moreover, he knew nothing of this matter, not having been in town on a former evening. He cursorily read the report of what occurred, and it struck him that the main point on which the question then turned was the statement that his noble Friend (the Earl of Longford) had given no notice. If that was the fact, and if his opinion had been asked, he should certainly have said that it would have been sharp practice to divide without giving notice. Since entering the House, however, he had been informed that his noble Friend had given notice of his present Motion.

Earl GRANVILLE: A private Notice, which I received late last night, when there was no time to take any action upon it.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: There is no Notice on the Paper.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, his noble Friend must explain why he did not give notice earlier, and whether he regarded it as a sufficient one. A private letter to the Leader of the Government was formerly deemed a fair Notice. He must remind the Government that this kind of difficulty arose from postponing business to the last moment. In the middle of the Session, or at any period when Peers resided in London, a few hours sooner or later made little difference: but he must say Her Majesty's Government had undertaken more than they should have done, and had thus thrown the business of the country upon this House in a very unfair manner at this period of the Session. He was told that on Monday a Bill of great importance, and which was a different Measure from that sent down to the House of Commons — the Scotch Education Bill would come before them. Almost the whole Peerage had left London; yet, within less than a week of the prorogation, a number of Bills were brought before the House. Now, when the Government had postponed important measures up to the last moment, it was impossible to expect that Peers would be so extremely scrupulous as under other circumstances they would be. For his own part, he should not vote either way on this question.

Earl BEAUCHAMP said, he thought some explanation ought to be given why the Bill, which was brought up on the 22nd of July, had been left without notice till the 30th. In the absence of such an explanation, the country would sustain the House in rejecting the Bill.

Lord LURGAN said, that the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had spoken of this Bill as a measure of persecution, directed against a certain political class. He did not agree with the noble Earl on that point; but he certainly thought that persecution had been applied to this Bill ever since it entered the House. He asked their Lordships to consider the effect which its rejection would have on the country. There had been a distinct Report by the Judge that corruption had extensively prevailed among the freemen, who were therefore placed in a false position, and surely ought to have an opportunity of clearing themselves. This was not, as it had been described, a Bill of Pains and Penalties, but simply one for inquiry.

The Duke of LEINSTER thought inquiry was necessary after the Report of the Judge, and hoped the House would pass the Bill.

Lord DUFFERIN thought it right, after the inquiry as to the delay in the second reading, and the suggestion that it was a lucky accident or management, to state exactly what had occurred. He was sorry to say that nobody had been to blame but himself; for, being very much engaged in business connected with the Government; and, having heard that the Bill had originally been introduced by a private Member, he did not at once pay that attention to it which he should have done had he known it to be a Government Bill. He hoped, however, that the House would not visit the Bill with a punishment for a fault which was solely his own.

EARL STANHOPE said, that while sure that the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had been unavoidably prevented from giving earlier notice, he regretted that it did not reach the noble Earl opposite in sufficient time to enable him to take any measures which it might seem to require. He attached much importance to this question of notice, and could not under the circumstances, with satisfaction to himself, vote against the Bill. He would suggest that the Bill should be postponed till Monday, in order that the objection to the Amendment, on the ground of inadequate notice, might be removed.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK said, he came down to the House yesterday, Wednesday, with a view to giving notice, but there being no Sitting for Public Business, and no clerk being in attendance, he sent a private Notice last night to Lord Bessborough, so that everything was done which could be done. In the interval between the first and second reading, many noble Lords returned to Ireland under the impression that it was not to be proceeded with, and he should, therefore, support the Amendment.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD disclaimed any intention of taking the House by surprise. He had not heard of any private intimation having been given to the Government that there would be no further opposition.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.* Bill read 3ª accordingly.

LORD REDESDALE said, he was glad the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had not pressed his Motion to a division, the usual notice not having been given; but he must strongly condemn the way in which the Bill had been conducted through their Lordships' House. It was all very well for the noble Lord (Lord Dufferin) to say that it was originally introduced by a private Member, but this was not the case.

LORD DUFFERIN said, that was his first impression. He believed it was Sir George Grey who first raised the question.

LORD REDESDALE: Sir George Grey, it was true, introduced a most improper measure for disfranchising the Dublin freemen; but that Bill was withdrawn, and this Bill introduced by the Attorney General for Ireland. Yet, though it was brought up to their Lordships' House on the 22nd of July, more than a week was allowed to pass before notice was given that the second reading would be moved on the 2nd of August. Under these circumstances, it was naturally considered that the Bill was not to be proceeded with. A large portion of their Lordships always left town at the close of the Session—unless it was known that business of importance was to be transacted; and, considering the command the Government had of obtaining the attendance of their supporters, and the number of noble Lords connected with the Government who were always present—as was shown by the division on Tuesday night, it was evident that if this mode of conducting public business was continued, the independence of the House would be gone, and it would become the mere slave of the Government, to pass whatever the Government might choose.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that after his noble Friend had explained the mistake which had been made, he was rather surprised at the language just addressed to their Lordships. It was perfectly true that this was not the Bill which Sir George Grey brought in; but it was thought to be a right and proper compromise on the subject, proposing to issue merely a Commission of Inquiry. With regard to the attendance in that House, he admitted that it was his duty, and those of his noble Colleagues behind him, to be there up to the very last day of the Session. But, even as an independent Member of the House, he had always felt it his duty to remain in town as long as Public Business of importance remained to be transacted, and he was quite sure that nothing would be more fatal to the character of the House than for their Lordships to allow it to be understood that their private affairs prevented their attendance until the prorogation. He was glad their

Lordships had given a striking example of the duty which they ought to fulfil in this matter, for he believed that very nearly 70 Peers had voted in the division on this question. He protested against the language of the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury), who complained that Her Majesty's Government had attempted so much more legislation this year than they could expect to carry; for their Lordships would remember that some half-dozen times noble Lords on both sides of the House had complained that the Government did not undertake very important legislation in addition to that which they had already in hand.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

CREDITORS SEQUESTRATIONS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Law relating to the Sequestration of Benefices in England and Wales—Was *presented* by The Earl of Harrowby; read 1ª. (No. 275.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 5th August, 1869.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee—*Second Report*—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons). [No. 398].

Public Bills — *Second Reading* — Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan [253]; Straits Settlements * [259]; Contagious Diseases * [255]; Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. * [256]; Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation * [254].

Committee—Charity Commissioners * [239]—r.p.

Committee — *Report* — Bishops Resignation [241]; Government of India Act Amendment [158]; Governor General of India [89]; Habitual Criminals [73-264]; Millbank Prison* [258]; Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* [248]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) * [261].

Third Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [238], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Government Annuities, &c. * [70].

NAVY—PURE LIME JUICE.—QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the Controller of the Victualling Department, or other Officer, has reported favourably on the use of lime juice without the addition of fifteen per cent of spirits; that pure lime juice has been sent to the tropics and returned in perfect condition; and that the addition of spirits reduces the antiscorbutic properties of lime juice; and, if he will lay any such Report or Reports upon the Table of the House?

Mr. BAXTER said, in reply, that three of the principal officers of the Victualling department of Deptford had reported favourably on the use of lime use without the addition of 15 per cent of spirits. Pure lime juice had also been sent to the Island of Ascension, and returned in excellent condition. He held in his hand the Report, and there was no objection to its production.

ARMY—POSSESSION OF BALL AMMUNITION.—QUESTION.

Mr. STACPOOLE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to two recent instances of a Non-commissioned Officer, whilst in the execution of his duty, having been shot by a private Soldier; whether he is not of opinion that the perpetration of these crimes was facilitated by the custom of leaving ball ammunition in the possession of Soldiers; and, whether he considers that the efficiency of the Army would be impaired by the adoption of a system under which Soldiers would be in possession of ball ammunition only during the time when the duty they may be employed upon necessitates their being furnished with it?

Mr. CARDWELL: Sir, this question was raised last Session of Parliament, and the decision then taken was to adhere to the existing practice. I think, however, it is impossible to deny that the constant possession of ball cartridge does give facility in a time of excitement for the perpetration of those crimes which we have occasion to deplore. I shall lose no time in considering what regulations it may be expedient to adopt for the purpose of obviating this evil; and my hon. Friend may rest assured that those regulations will be framed in such a manner as not to impair the efficiency of the Army.

CANADA—PATENT LAW.—QUESTION.

Mr. BENTALL said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. J. Howard), he wished to ask the Under Secretary of

State for the Colonies, If his attention has been directed to the New Patent Law Act passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of Canada, and to which the Governor General gave his assent on the 22nd June last; if he is aware that by the terms of this Act the rights hitherto enjoyed by British subjects and Foreigners are abolished, and that unlike the Patent Laws of England and all other countries, the benefits of its provisions are limited to persons permanently resident in its own dominion; and, whether the Colonial Office is prepared to recommend the Government to advise Her Majesty to withhold or postpone her assent to the Bill, with a view to give an opportunity to the Canadian Legislature to re-consider its provisions?

MR. MONSELL said, in reply, that his attention had been directed to a copy of the Act given in a Canadian newspaper, but no copy had been sent over here officially. By the former Canadian Act, 22 *Vict.* c. 34, s. 3, a person to obtain a patent in Canada must have been a "subject of Her Majesty, and resident in the Province." By this new Act the residence must have been "for at least one year next before the application." In other words, the residence of the former Act had a minimum fixed of "one year at the least." The new Act was the same as the former Nova Scotia Act, c. 117. It differed from the New Brunswick Act, in which no such limitation was fixed. The subject of patents was essentially one with which the Dominion of Canada might deal, and this was evidenced by the terms of the 18th section of the Imperial Act, 15 & 16 *Vict.*, c. 83, in which it was specially provided that nothing in the Act should be deemed to give operation to any Letters Patent granted under the authority of the Act in any colony in which such or the like Letters Patent would be invalid by the law in force in the same colony for the time being.

MR. MACFIE said, that next Session he would call the attention of the House to the propriety of having at the Colonial Office a set of all the Acts of the Colonial Parliaments.

UNITED STATES—CONSULATE AT CHICAGO.—QUESTION.

MR. BOWRING said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with reference to his recent statement in Committee of Supply respecting the abolition of the Consulate at Chicago, Whether Her Majesty's Government have resolved upon such abolition in pursuance of the Report of a Select Committee of this House; and, if so, in what year that Committee sat, and what precise recommendation was made by it on the subject?

MR. OTWAY said, in reply, that the Committee to which his hon. Friend referred was not, strictly speaking, a Committee of that House, although Members of Parliament sat on it, and it was presided over by a Cabinet Minister, Mr. Milner Gibson. It was known at the Foreign Office by the name of the Official Committee, and was appointed in 1858 to see how far effect could be given to some previous recommendations. The proceedings were laid before Parliament in 1860, and if they had not attracted the attention of his hon. Friend, he would venture to recommend them to his notice. The Report was precisely as he (Mr. Otway) stated the other night. It recommended the abolition of the Consulate at Chicago, Buffalo, and Elsinore. The Consul for Chicago resigned, and Lord Clarendon then determined upon the abolition of the Consulate.

CASE OF JAMES BELL.

QUESTION.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of a cattle-drover named James Bell, who, wrongfully convicted at the Middlesex Sessions of March 1868, on a charge of sheep stealing, was sentenced to five years' penal servitude; whether it is not the fact that his innocence of the alleged offence was fully proved after he had suffered six months of his sentence, and that the guilty parties were detected and punished; whether Bell has not Memorialized the Home Office, praying for an investigation into his case, and for the expenses incurred by his relatives in their prolonged efforts to prove his innocence, and bring the real culprits to justice; and also for some compensation for his own sufferings of mind and body during an imprisonment of six months, previous to his receiving a free pardon; whether the expenses of a Mr. Guerrier, who interested himself in Bell's case, have not been paid by the Crown; and, if so, on what ground were the expenses of Bell's relatives refused to be paid; and, whether the evidence which led to an innocent man's conviction was not that of three members of the police force?

MR. BRUCE said, in reply, that the case of James Bell had been decided by his predecessor. James Bell, a cattle-drover, was convicted at the Middlesex Sessions of March, 1868, and sentenced to five years' imprisonment, on the evidence of three policemen, who swore to his identity. There could be no doubt they were mistaken. The matter was taken up by Mr. Guerrier, a cattle salesman in London, who expended a large sum in investigating the case. The innocence of the man was proved to the satisfaction of his (Mr. Bruce's) predecessor, and a free pardon was granted. Mr. Guerrier's expenses were paid by the Government. He was not aware that any application was made by Bell's relatives for the payment of the expenses incurred by them; but, if so, they would have stood in the same position as Mr. Guerrier. With regard to compensation to Bell for his wrongful imprisonment, it belonged to a class of cases unhappily large and of a painful character. It had never been the practice of the Government to grant compensation to an unfortunate man for the result of a mistaken verdict. If the principle were applied to criminal cases it must be extended to civil cases where loss and suffering had been inflicted. Numerous applications of a similar character had been made to the Home Office and refused. The case of Barber was an exception to the general rule, as it was investigated by a Committee of the House of Commons, and a special Parliamentary Grant was made.

INDIA—BANK OF BENGAL.—QUESTION.

MR. GILPIN said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether there has been any change in the agency of the Bank of Bengal at Bombay?

MR. GRANT DUFF said, in reply, that there had been no change whatever in the policy of the Government in this matter, as lately announced by himself in answer to the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. G. B. Gregory); and he might add that he thought it to the last degree improbable that there would be any change.

SCOTLAND—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

QUESTION.

MR. M'LAREN said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government have considered the propriety of providing some additional means for the transaction of Public Business connected with Scotland?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, this subject, in consequence of the representations of many Scotch Members, has been for some time under the notice of the Government. I am sure it will be generally admitted that the business of Scotland has been conducted with great ability and efficiency for many years by the Lords Advocate, and by the present Lord Advocate, who brings so much learning and experience to the discharge of that office. But it has been represented by many Members connected with Scotland that there is a great deal of administrative business which is not of a legal character, and which, in their opinion, may be more appropriately lodged in hands not legal. In the second place, it has been represented to the Government that there are various establishments in Edinburgh in which it will be perfectly practicable to make improvements and economies in case the Parliamentary strength were increased so as to be available in this House for the management of Scotch affairs. These two principal allegations have been submitted to the Government. The second of these representations, it is quite evident, is the essential portion of the case. The course we propose to take is, during the Recess, by such administrative means as are at our command, to make inquiry into the establishments now existing at Edinburgh, which are available for Scotch business, with a view to ascertain how far economy in those establishments, by their abolition, reduction, and modification, may be rendered practicable in the event of the appointment of any new Parliamentary officer for the transaction of Scotch business. We will prosecute that inquiry as well as we can during the Recess. It is perfectly possible that when Parliament meets again, and the result of such an inquiry is presented, hon. Members may think that a Parliamentary Inquiry in furtherance and prosecution of the same purpose may be desirable. We will do the best we can, but if a further investigation by a Parliamentary Committee should be deemed desirable by those specially connected with Scotland, and interested in the effective transaction of its affairs, we shall be perfectly ready to lend ourselves also to the further inquiry.

MR. BOUVERIE: I should like to ask whether the proposed course of proceeding is taken by the Government in consequence of their being dissatisfied with the administration of Scotch affairs, or, whether it has been taken in consequence of representations made from without to the Government; and, if so, in what form and shape those representations have been made?

MR. GLADSTONE: The inquiry we are ready to make did not arise from any observations made by the Government themselves, but arose out of a variety of communications made to us by Scotch Members. My right hon. Friend will, I am quite sure, understand that we think it our duty to ascertain the whole facts of the case before the time comes when it will be proper for us to form or express any opinion on the subject. With regard to the character of the representations, they were entirely informal, and of the same nature as those which are happily always in progress between Members of the Government, and the Members of this House.

BISHOPS RESIGNATION BILL—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 241.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. GLADSTONE: This Bill relates to a subject of so much importance, that I should not be justified in moving that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair without explaining, in a few sentences, why such a Bill has been introduced and pressed on at the present period of the Session, although the occasion for such a measure is sufficiently notorious to dispense with any long explanation or defence of its provisions. In the early part of the Session representations were made to me respecting the unfortunate position in which some of the dioceses of the South of England were placed in consequence of the great age or infirmity of the Bishops charged with the care of those dioceses. I stated that the evil was undeniable, and required a remedy; but that it was very desirable that a matter of this kind should be considered in the first instance by the episcopal heads of the Church, and that the result of those counsels should be awaited by the Government. In harmony with that announcement, the Archbishop of Canterbury took measures to ascertain the sentiments of his episcopal brethren, and they came to the conclusion that it was necessary to pass, without delay, a general measure by which such cases might be met. The question then arose, what should be the scope and purport of that measure? In the framing of this Bill we had to take into consideration—for the Archbishop acted in concurrence with the Government—the very great difficulty of originating a comprehensive measure on this subject—a measure providing legislative enactments, under which, in every case where a Bishop was incapacitated either from mental or bodily infirmity, and quite independent of his will or choice, the appointment of an efficient episcopal superintendent might be secured. That, evidently, is the aim which Members both of this House and of the other House of Parliament have had in view. In the 3rd clause words have been introduced which, as the Bill now stands, would make it practicable to appoint a coadjutor, whether with the will or against the will of a Bishop who is incapacitated. And an hon. Member (Mr. Dickinson) has given notice of an Amendment going even further than that, and providing for a system of what may be called compulsory resignation. With respect to a Bill of so wide a scope as a Bill upon either of these bases would be, I would wish to point out that it is in our judgment wholly beyond the power of Parliament to grapple with it under present circumstances. Nor do I speak merely of the date which we have now reached —the first week in August; there has been no part of the present Session, crowded as it has been with most important business, when we could have undertaken in this House to go through the provisions of an Act involving a matter of such extreme delicacy as the power of removing against his will a great public officer — to call him nothing else—like the Bishop of a diocese, who is supposed to have fallen into a state of incapacity for the discharge of his duties. To pass such a measure would be a most arduous undertaking, since we have not taken the same course in the case of other functionaries enjoying great public emoluments. I am not saying that a time may not come when we might find it necessary to take some step of the kind; but I think it better that we should apply a remedy to present inconveniences and should stop short of questions so difficult and thorny as those we should have to encounter if we attempted to pass a law to enact, in certain cases, compulsory episcopal resignation. The leading provisions in the measure as introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the other House of Parliament—and as I should propose that this House should agree to them—are two. It is proposed that any Archbishop or Bishop in England, being incapacitated by age or by some mental or physical infirmity — it may be well, perhaps, to insert the word "permanent" —so as to imply that he shall be really and permanently incapacitated from the discharge of episcopal duties — shall have adjusted for him certain terms on which he may resign; and, subject to the responsibility of the Ministry of the day, who will be bound to be satisfied that this is a legitimate transaction, and who will be accountable for it as well as for all their other acts, a certain pension may be assigned to him. And not only a pension, but if Her Majesty should see fit, under certain circumstances, particularly of great age, the episcopal residence which he has hitherto enjoyed may be likewise assigned to him. It is it not necessary now to enter into the precise pecuniary terms on which these resignations are arranged; but we endeavoured in framing the Bill to make as fair a division as we could of the income between the incoming and the outgoing Bishop, with reference to the respective needs of each. There is a proviso in a clause which relates to the case of a Bishop appointed before the year 1832. I was not aware of that proviso till the Bill reached this House. I presume it was to meet one particular case; and though there is much to be said in its favour, still an amendment in the proviso will be requisite, the reasons for which I shall state when we come to the clause in Committee. There is also a series of clauses, beginning with the third, which refers to the appointment of coadjutor Bishops. As far as the Government are concerned, I must beg the Committee, forming a judgment upon these clauses, to suppose that the Amendment which I have placed upon the Paper has been carried. The clause, as amended, would then run to this effect. When a Bishop is incapacitated by permanent mental infirmity, a coadjutor Bishop, with right of succession, may be appointed, and, subject to the conditions of the Act, may assume episcopal jurisdiction in the diocese. The clause as to resignation may be called wholly new; no such provision exists in our law at present. In 1856 an Act was passed to enable two particular Bishops to resign upon specified terms; but it was extensively felt that it was objectionable to appear to make such retirements a subject of pecuniary bargains with individuals, and that the proper method would be to lay down a general law applicable equally to all. With respect to the subject of the 3rd clause, the appointment of a substitute for a Bishop mentally incapacitated, this legislation is not altogether new; and I hope hon. Members will be good enough to consider this clause in conjunction with the provisions at present upon the statute book. Under an Act passed by the Government of Sir Robert Peel, if a Bishop is mentally incapacitated two things may be done. In the first place, an episcopal person—that is to say, a person who has received episcopal consecration, may be appointed to perform episcopal acts in his diocese, and in the second place, a non-episcopal person may be appointed to perform those acts of jurisdiction which do not require the episcopal character. What I would submit is, that this is a very unsatisfactory method of making provision for the oversight of a diocese, and that the 3rd clause makes a great practical improvement in the law. It is not the mere perfunctory discharge of certain duties, such as the institution to benefices or the correction of clerks, nor yet the more strictly episcopal acts of confirmation or the consecration of churches; it is not the mere mechanical performance of duties that you want, but the living influence of the man whose work it is to promote the work of the Church in the diocese standing in the public eye, subject to observation, to criticism, and to all the sense of responsibility attaching to a duly appointed Bishop. And our proposal is that, instead of these merely makeshift provisions, we should adopt a plan under which, speaking generally, the patronage of the Crown that would accrue in the see should be anticipated, and a man appointed at once, with restricted emoluments, and subject to a variety of conditions set out in the Act, but who, except as regards these conditions and restrictions as to emoluments, should be devoted to the diocese and bound to carry on his work, exactly as if he were a Bishop in full possession. These are the two leading propositions of the Bill, and it is on the basis of these two propositions that I trust the House will be disposed to entertain the measure. For certainly the practical evil that it aims to redress is a very serious one, and is felt by the inhabitants of no very inconsiderable portion of England. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) the other night, in the course of the few words which he uttered, said it would be desirable to restrict the operation of this measure to a limited period of time; to that I cheerfully accede. I think it very desirable for two reasons. In the first place, it is sufficiently plain that this principle of resignation, although the need of it be more urgent in the case of Bishops, yet applies equally to parochial incumbents and to cathedral officers, subject to proper guards and checks, which will have to be carefully considered, remembering how large a proportion of clerical patronage is in private hands, and that some of it, as in the case of advowsons, may be classed as a marketable commodity. That is a reason why we shall do well not only to contemplate, but to secure a return of the attention of Parliament to this subject, in order, after the short experience which this Bill will give us,—after a couple of years,—that we may be in a position to judge how far its provisions are capable of extension to other members of the Church. It is also obvious that the remedy which we are now providing may not be altogether sufficient—it may not be the best which the particular circumstances of the case admit of, and in this view, accordingly, it will be very desirable that the matter should be further considered by Parliament. I hope I have sufficiently explained and vindicated the provisions of the third clause as they are proposed by the Government; but I would just say one word in justification of the view taken by the Government and the Archbishop of Canterbury when the Bill was introduced. The words at present in the clause enable a coadjutor to be appointed, not only in the case of mental but physical infirmity. We have, therefore, to contemplate, as a consequence of that provision, inteference in a diocese where the Bishop, being or being supposed to be, physically incapacitated from the discharge of his duties, is unwilling to resign. Consequently, this is to be a coercive process. And if it is to be coercive it is evident that it will require a set of provisions most carefully framed and most elaborately guarded to prevent the process being put into operation where it is not fully justified, or without due consideration of private rights. These provisions, which are supposed to refer merely to cases of mental incapacity, would not be adequate in any manner such as justice would demand if we were to contemplate, not the actual removal of the Bishop by coercion, but the virtual supplanting of the Bishop by placing all his ecclesiastical powers in the hands of a coadjutor Bishop. Another objection of a practical character that has been taken is this. I think it is conclusive. By the 3rd clause the power given in the case of a Bishop being physically incapacitated is not to be put in force unless he shall have failed adequately to provide for the performance of his duties. Everyone will see what would happen under this clause. It is not merely what the Bishop would do, but what the family of the Bishop would do. We should have a number of what are called stop-gap Bishops, makeshift Bishops, stray Bishops returned from the colonies or elsewhere, and we should have again that perfunctory and mechanical performance of the duties set up before the world which would be a blind and a delusion, but which at the same time would totally prevent the Archbishop from declaring that adequate provision had not been made for the discharge of the duties of the incapacitated Bishop. I think that the House will be satisfied that the attempt to extend this clause is unwise, and that if we are to seek to introduce coercive powers at all we must do so at a period when we have more time at our disposal in which to consider with care what safeguards shall be adopted in incorporating such a provision into our law. I think that is all I need now say, and therefore I beg to conclude by moving that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"—(*Mr. W. E. Gladstone.*)

Mr. DICKINSON said, he rose on this occasion with considerable reluctance, because this measure had come down from the other House with the authority of the Bishops and of the Government, and therefore it could not be said to be an ill-considered Bill. The Bill had been carefully considered during the early part of the Session, and the circumstances which had given rise to it had been long notorious. It was therefore to be expected that it would have at once commended itself to the good sense of the House, but he was sorry to say that it failed to do so. He did not think the measure took a proper view of episcopal duties and episcopal responsibilities. The Bill provided in a general way for filling up a bishopric when the existing Bishop was incapable of performing its duties. No doubt such a state of things as was contemplated by the Bill was a great evil and scandal, for which some remedy must be found, but while the evil was simple the remedy was equally simple. A Bishop should be treated in the same way as any other public functionary. A Bishop was a public functionary who received public pay for the performance of public duties, and when he was incapable of discharging those duties other provision should be made for their proper discharge, and the emoluments of the office should go to the person who discharged them. He admitted that there was a difficulty in dealing with freehold offices when they were called on to abolish them, because they were open to the argument that the incumbent was ready to go on performing his duties, but that was not the case here. The holder of every public office held it on the condition that he was at all times ready to perform its duties, and he had no right to take the pay of the State when he could no longer perform them. It was for the House to consider whether they would sanction a system of buying out incompetent officials. The question was a serious one as to whether they would extend the principle of giving large retiring allowances to people who, from age or other circumstances, were no longer able to perform their duties. No public officer who became incapacitated should be entitled to more than a fair superannuation allowance, and he approved of the principle that such allowance should be provided for out of the emoluments of the successor. In parts of this Bill there was a looseness to be condemned or a casuistry which was very suspicious. In one clause it provided for the resignation of a Bishop or Archbishop, who was incapacited by age, or mental or physical infirmity from the due performance of his duty; but, in the next or coercive clause, incapacity from age was entirely left out, so that a man who could not leave his bed might still continue to be a Bishop. His (Mr. Dickinson's) view was that when a Bishop was incapable he should cease to be a Bishop, and instead of having a coadjutor appointed to do his work, they should have the real article in the shape of another Bishop appointed in his place. An incapacitated Bishop ought not to retain his seat in the House of Lords, or they might have a lunatic Bishop sitting and voting on great questions of State policy. The 3rd clause of the Bill provided that there should be no power to turn a Bishop out of his office if he himself had made arrangements for the due performance of his duties. The 11th clause related to Archbishops, but it did not remove them for mere bodily infirmity, but only for mental infirmity; so that there was one law for a Bishop and another for an Archbishop. Instead of having a clear and simple cure for a clear and simple evil, there was to be this complicated state of affairs. And then the Bill, instead of being permanent, was only to be a temporary measure, which made it a great deal more objectionable. When the present cause of scandal was removed, probably nothing more would be heard of the subject until the next scandal arose. If a good and effectual reform could not be introduced, it would be better that the scandal should remain until a sound and complete measure could be framed. This was not a case in which tentative measures were necessary, because the nature of the evil for which a remedy ought to be applied was perfectly well known. Then, as to the question of resignation or deprivation, he was astonished at the mode in which the incomes of the Bishops were disposed of by the Bill. When a Bishop who was permanently incapacitated from the discharge of his duties retired into private clerical life, he should have only such an allowance as was sufficient for him in his altered position. The Archbishop of Canterbury had, he believed, £15,000 a year, and the Archbishop of York also had a very large annual income; but, in each of these cases, as in that of all the other Bishops, the income was given because of the dignity and responsibilities of the office, and not because the office was filled by a particular individual. Great demands were made upon them; and when a new Bishop took the place of one who retired from incapacity, he should surely have the means of performing all the accessories of the office in the shape of subscriptions to works of charity and usefulness. Now this Bill provided that if a Bishop resigned voluntarily he should receive one-third of his income, or £2,000 a year, whichever sum happened to be the larger; but the incapacitated Bishop who refused to resign was to be left in possession of his palace, and to receive the whole of his income, with the exception of the sum paid to the coadjutor who was appointed, and which, in the case of a Bishop, was £2,000 a year; in the case of the Archbishop of York, £3,000 a year; and in the case of the Archbishop of Canterbury, £4,000 a year. An incapacitated Archbishop of Canterbury, therefore, might receive £11,000 a year, while the person who did all the work would get only £4,000. If this had been a Motion for the second reading of the Bill, he should have moved its rejection; but, as it was, he hoped the House would be able to remedy its defects in Committee, and with that view he had given notice of several Amendments, to the effect that the person appointed to fill up a see, under the provisions of this Bill, should not be a Bishop coadjutor but a real Bishop, receiving the chief emoluments of the office.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, that the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Dickinson) had answered his whole speech by the first two or three words of it. In his first sentences the hon. and learned Gentleman said he could not see the difference between a Bishop and any other public functionary, and therefore he thought that a Bishop should have his pay only as long as he could perform his work. The civil office which was most analogous to the office of Bishop was that of Judge. A Judge had a nominal salary of £5,000 a year but an actual one of £4,500, as about £500 a year of his salary went in circuit expenses. A Judge after fifteen years' service might retire of his own free will on a retiring allowance of £3,500, though he might be in the full vigour of his mind, and quite as capable, if not more so, of performing his judicial functions as he was at the time of his elevation to the Bench. This retiring allowance of £3,500 was saddled on the Consolidated Fund; but under this Bill the Bishop who had to retire from mental incapacity, and who was in all probability very old, would have to share his pittance with the Bishop appointed to discharge the diocesan duties. The country was not saddled with any burden in the matter. The freehold office had to keep the new Bishop and the poor old retired clergyman. He believed that Bishops were something more than mere stipendiaries of the State, and he was anxious to see that view enforced, even though it might, as in this case, touch the pockets of the Bishops themselves; but assuming with the hon. and learned Gentleman that they were no more than episcopal servants of the State, ought they not to be treated as well as its judicial servants? He thought his right hon. Friend at the head of the Government was adopting a judicious course in confining legislation on the subject at present to the immediate wants of the case, and in leaving the general question of parochial as well as diocesan provision for another time. He hoped that the House would be allowed to go into Committee on the Bill.

MR. HADFIELD said, he rose to move that the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill this day three months. Parliament had passed a Bill this Session depriving, after a certain time, the Irish Bishops of the right to sit in the House of Lords. That had been done for the purpose of establishing religious equality in Ireland; but he contended that the principle of religious equality was not fully established in this part of the United Kingdom so long as the English Prelates had seats in the Upper House, while at the same time the Nonconformists of England had no representatives, and indeed desired to have none, in the House of Lords, and Scotland had long dispensed with episcopal representation. The Churchmen in this country formed only half the population, and he had reason to believe that a majority of their body were desirous that Bishops should be removed from the House of Lords. That sentiment was constantly growing, and very shortly it would prevail. In the interest of the Church of England it was desirable that her Bishops should be relieved from the political services in which they were engaged, and should bestow their exclusive attention on the affairs of their dioceses. Had the Bishops, during the present Session, been faithful to Protestantism? Nine of them, forgetful of their professions of loyalty to Protestantism, for supporting which they received their pay, voted in favour of endowing the Catholic Church, to the indignation and grief of the members of the Church of England—they were, in fact, in favour of giving £2,000,000 as hush-money out of the funds of the Irish Church, if the members of that Church, on its disestablishment, were allowed to go off with £10,000,000. All Catholic Peers, in the House of Lords, on the part of their Catholic brethren, indignantly refused to accept hush-money from their natural foes. During the last thirty years an opinion had been growing in this country that the Bishops must leave the House of Lords. He should like to know what the First Minister thought of the conduct of the Bishops in the House of Lords. They had attacked the character of that right hon. Gentleman, whose name would go down to posterity as that of a man who had achieved probably the greatest work on record. He (Mr. Hadfield) would not be satisfied if this Bill were allowed to proceed. It was an unseasonable measure, and he hoped the First Minister would postpone it till another Session. Last year twenty-one Prelates voted against the Suspensory Bill, and this year all the Prelates voted against the Irish Church Bill, except one, who voted for it, but that Bishop having voted for it once, never did so again. There was an interest in another place inimical to the interests of the United Kingdom. A Notice was given in this House that the state of the Church in Wales should be considered next Session; and an hon. Member had intimated that he would try the question next Session whether Bishops should or should not retain their seats in the House of Lords. The noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Viscount Sandon) was alarmed at the progress of Ritualism, and was resolved to bring forward the question, and had given notice of his intention to do so. All these things showed that there would be no rest for the Prime Minister until he eased the public mind as to the presence of those Gentlemen (the Bishops) in the other House. He should like to call attention at a future period to the history of the Bishops since the Revolution. [" Question."] He would say no more on that subject at present; his opinions on removing the Bishops from the House of Lords would be heard throughout the length and breadth of the country, and he would now move, as he had intimated, that the House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee.

MR. D. DALRYMPLE, in seconding the Motion of the hon. Member for Sheffield, said, he had no sympathy with that hon. Member's anti-episcopal view. The question of what was to be done with incapacitated Bishops and clergy generally was one of the most difficult and intricate subjects with which the Church and the country had to deal, and it had been repeatedly discussed at Church Congresses and elsewhere. This Bill was very imperfect in its character; it was very little known, and it had been very little discussed. It was brought forward at the fag-end of a fatiguing Session, and he objected to its being passed lest it should be taken as a precedent in determining the basis of future arrangements in reference to the clergy. Such a Bill ought to have more consideration than could possibly be given to this. The hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), who drew an analogy between Bishops and Judges of the land, forgot that the arrangement with respect to the Judges had been made by a House of Commons containing a good many lawyers; and he feared that this Bill was not the less objectionable that it had clearly on it the stamp of a House containing a good many Bishops.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Hadfield,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. BOUVERIE: I am very sorry, Sir, to say, after the best consideration I can give to this important Bill, in the very limited time allowed for the consideration of it, I shall feel it my duty to vote with the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) if he goes to a division. As a permanent measure the Bill is admitted to be thoroughly defective; and that admission is made by the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government for limiting the operation of the Bill to two years. The Bill deals with only one corner of a great subject. Perhaps the House is not aware that there is a prohibitory statute which renders it penal for the inferior clergy to resign under the circumstances in which this Bill will sanction the resignation of Bishops. That being the state of the law, I ask—Is it right that we should pass an Act of Parliament expressly providing for that step being taken by incapacitated Bishops which we have made it penal for the inferior clergy to take? I think that neither the Bishops who framed this Bill nor the Government can have given any attention to the state of the law upon the subject. In this respect alone, then, the Bill is most thoroughly deficient and incomplete, and as a permanent measure it cannot be defended for a moment. Therefore the First Minister is right in proposing to limit its operation to two years, and the ground is taken from under all argument based on the permanent advantages to be derived from the Bill. Regarding it, then, as a temporary measure, we know that it is designed to meet two or three particular cases referred to by the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Dickinson). One is that of the see of Winchester and another that of the see of Exeter. A more munificent Prelate than the Bishop of Winchester never adorned the Episcopal Bench; the generosity of spirit he has displayed on the Ecclesiastical Commission, and which I have had the opportunity of knowing, has been most exemplary. He has not been placed under the restrictive system established by the Church Commission Act; he holds the estates of the see under arrangements which come down from the time of the Reformation; and, if rumour speaks truly, the income derived from them in modern times is something like £16,000 or £18,000 a year. No one appreciates more highly than I do the eminent character of the right rev. Prelate; but are we really about to provide that he shall have a retiring pension of something like £6,000 a year? In point of wealth the bishopric of Exeter is far below that of Winchester. The see of Exeter, which is also held upon the old tenure and not under the Church Commission Act, is one of the poorest; and I believe the income is something less than £2,000 a year. For years the Bishop has been totally incapacitated for discharging the duties of the see, and it is proposed to pension him with £2,000 a year, a sum equivalent to the whole income of the bishopric. Of course, no one would wish to see a Prelate of such distinction and ability left to starve because he is incapable of discharging his duties; but what is the fact? It is well known that the Bishop enjoys one of the prebends of Durham Cathedral; his income from this source is supposed to be £5,000 or £6,000 a year, and the office is a sinecure, the only duty attaching to it being that of residence for a certain time in a beautiful cathedral town. Ought not that income to be sufficient for the Bishop of Exeter? Ought not he to feel that the duties of his episcopate are, as far as he is concerned, entirely neglected because he is unable to discharge them? The comparatively humble revenues of the Bishop of Exeter might surely be surrendered for the appointment of a Bishop to discharge those duties. As far as I know the facts of those two cases, I must say I think we are hardly justified in making the special arrangements provided by this Bill in order to meet them. I cannot help urging on the Government the propriety of dealing with the whole subject of the retirement of Bishops and clergy in a more general way. I admit that provision should be made for retiring allowances, but I contend that in these two particular instances about as little of a case has been made out as possibly could be made. I shall therefore vote for the Amendment.

Mr. MOWBRAY said, he had come down to the House to give his humble assistance to the Government in carrying through this measure, which was of a strictly remedial character. He thought they had some reason to complain of the manner in which opposition was offered to the Bill at its present stage. The second reading had been agreed to without cavil or debate on Monday night. [“No, no!”] He repeated that the Bill had been read a second time without any opposition having been offered to it, and he submitted that it was contrary to all the usage and practice of that House that an Amendment of this kind should be moved on going into Committee without notice being given. His observations did not apply to the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Dickinson) because he seemed to feel there was an obligation laid on him not to respond to the invitation made to him to move the rejection of the Bill. His observations applied to the Members for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie), Bath (Mr. Dalrymple), and Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield). Perhaps the course taken by the hon. Member for Sheffield, with his well-known anti-episcopal views, should not excite much surprise, though even from him they had a right to expect some notice. But something different was to have been expected from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock. That right hon. Gentleman was an Ecclesiastical Commissioner, and was intimately conversant with questions such as that under discussion. He was, moreover, the greatest stickler for the observance of the minutest rules and forms of the House, and was ever ready to call those to Order who transgressed them. For him, therefore, to put himself forward to lead the Opposition against the Bill at that stage was certainly a most extraordinary thing. The right hon. Member for Kilmarnock, possessing as he did a full knowledge of the ecclesiastical revenues, might, at least, in going into the case have given the House a statement more consistent with the real facts than the one he had submitted. He led the House to believe that the Bishop of Exeter had an income of between £5,000 and £6,000 a year from his prebendal stall at Durham.

Mr. BOUVERIE: I have no knowledge of the fact myself, but it is generally understood that such is the case.

Mr. MOWBRAY said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman meant to insinuate by that that he adopted the general understanding? Did he not from his position as an Ecclesiastical Commissioner know that the income of the Bishop referred to was only something between £3,000 and £4,000? [*Ironical cheers.*] Hon. Gentlemen might cheer, but he submitted that there was a great deal of difference between £3,000 and £5,000, and £4,000 and £6,000. When such a statement as that made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock was made *ad invidium* against a right rev. Prelate, the House had a right to demand a precise knowledge of the facts. In what way did the right hon. Gentleman regard the question? First of all he started with a most extraordinary proposition. He urged the House not to pass this Bill as regarded the Bishops, because they would hereafter have to do something for the inferior clergy, That might or might not have been a good argument previous to the year 1856; but in that year Parliament passed Bills allowing the Bishop of London (Bishop Blomfield) and the Bishop of Durham (Bishop Maltby) to resign. It was, therefore, too late now to tell them that there was anything penal in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman further said that this was not a permanent Bill but a temporary one, and that it only applied to two Bishops. He (Mr. Mowbray) submitted that that was not a fair way of putting the case. The right hon. Gentleman exaggerated the incomes of the Bishops in order to create a prejudice against the Bill. Looked at properly it would be found that the Bill was general in its provisions, and it could be made applicable during the two years it was to remain in force to other cases besides those of the two right rev. Prelates. He did not at that period of the Session wish to detain the House with anything like a speech. He wished merely to give his support to Her Majesty's Government in a measure which he considered both timely and seasonable. It was quite true that it had come up at rather a late period of the Session; but the Prime Minister had told them early in the Session that the subject was likely to become matter of legislation. The hon. Member for Sheffield was naturally triumphant that Parliament had disestablished one branch of the Church of England, and he grudged that Church even the small remedial measure under discussion. But if they remembered that the Church of England was identified with the State and was of course subject to legislation, this small remedy ought not to be withheld. He considered that the Bill was a practical remedy for a practical grievance, and that it had been brought forward at the proper time. Both the hon. Members for Bath and Stroud, while objecting to the Bill, admitted that some system of resignation for Bishops was absolutely necessary. With respect to the second portion of the Bill, he thought that the slightest consideration of the arguments urged by the Premier must prove that whatever questions might arise as to coadjutor Bishops, the Bill was an improvement upon the law as it at present existed under the Act of 1843. He would not follow the hon. Member for Sheffield through all his references to profane history and the voluntary system. But he must protest against one of his remarks. The hon. Member claimed that the Nonconformists constituted a majority of the people of England; but how far that was the case might be judged of by the fact that in 1861 the Dissenters in the House opposed Lord Palmerston and Sir George Cornewall Lewis and prevented a religious Census of the people of the kingdom being taken. The hon. Member, therefore, had no right to appeal to imaginary numbers.

MR. HADFIELD said, the right hon. Gentleman was quite wrong. The hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines) proposed that an enumeration should be made throughout the kingdom.

MR. ACLAND said, he felt bound to bear his humble testimony to the urgent necessity in the South part of England for some practical measure of this kind being passed without delay. It was not necessary to go into details in answer to his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie). He would not discuss the question of the precise income of these two Bishops; but his right hon. Friend knew very well the constant inconvenience in the Ecclesiastical Commission of not being able to refer to a responsible Bishop, or to bring his personal and moral influence to bear on any part of his diocese. He urged the Government to lose no time in passing this measure as a practical remedy for a great and admitted evil. There was wisdom, he thought, in placing Parliament under the necessity of re-considering this matter in all its bearings, after a short experience in the working of this measure. He hoped the Government would not give way.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he had been most anxious the other night that this Bill should be explained, and it was only in consequence of the state of his right hon. Friend the First Minister's health that a full statement on the subject had not been given. He must say that the arguments used by his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) had convinced him that it would not be desirable to proceed with the Bill. This was a very wide question, and he thought it unfair to legislate for the heads of the Church, who had very large incomes, while they provided no retirement for the humbler clergy, with far smaller incomes.

MR. M'LAREN wished to say a word respecting the conduct of the Dissenters at the last Census. He ventured to say that the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Mowbray) was a very inaccurate statement indeed. The Dissenters merely objected to the Census being taken in a particular way. The Census of 1851 took an account of all who attended places of worship, and the results arrived at were most important; but under the Census of 1861 the Government proposed to ask each person to what denomination he belonged, and the great mass of inhabitants in large towns, who attended no place of worship at all, would have returned themselves as members of the Church of England. This led to statements which for statistical purposes were perfectly useless. If the present Bill had proposed to increase the number of Bishops in the House of Lords, he should have opposed it; but as it was only proposed for the purpose of re-placing in the diocesan work inefficient persons by efficient ones, he should support it.

MR. BOWRING said, that his constituents took great interest in this subject, in consequence of the unsatisfactory state of the diocese of Exeter for many years past. He should oppose the Amendment.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am desirous of saying a few words in reference to the remarks of my hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird). It was undoubtedly perfectly competent for any or all the Members of this House to oppose the principle of this Bill upon the Motion for your leaving the Chair. There can be no question about that. For myself, I took it as a great courtesy and kindness on the part of the House to allow, as it did, the second reading of the Bill to pass without discussion. I am bound to say that I conceive it quite possible the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) may have waived putting any Amendment on the Paper when he saw the Notice of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Collins) to move that the order for the second reading be discharged. With regard to the question itself, I think that the speeches we have heard from Gentlemen connected with the diocese of Exeter will weigh very greatly with this House, as well as the speeches made by Gentlemen opposite. It must be borne in mind that the Church of England is an Episcopal Church, and that it is presumed, whether rightly or wrongly, that a Bishop is of some use. But there happen, unfortunately, to be four or five dioceses of which it may almost be said that they have no Bishops, and all that we propose is to provide Bishops for them, provided the present holders of the sees are willing to cooperate with us. The hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Dickinson) says there is great difficulty connected with this question of retirement. I myself began by stating that if you are to frame an universal and compulsory system of retirement the matter would be most difficult. I, for one, should hesitate to set myself to such a work. But, as far as voluntary resignation goes, I venture to say that the difficulty is small. The resignation of Bishops is admitted by the ecclesiastical law; and so strongly did the House feel upon this matter of resignation in the year 1856, that it passed a Bill to enable two particular Bishops to retire. The real question is, whether or not we are prepared to apply a practical remedy to a very serious practical evil, and on that question I will now take the judgment of the House.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 112; Noes 26: Majority 86.

Mr. Gladstone

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Resignation of Bishop).

Mr. DICKINSON *moved,* in page 1, line 15, to leave out from "is" to "he" in line 16.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he thought it would be better to retain these words, as they set forth that the Bill was to proceed merely upon the principle of voluntary resignation. He was not sure whether that system would prove to be altogether sufficient; but if it did not, they might then proceed in the direction suggested by the Amendment. He had no objection to the insertion of the word "permanent" before "physical infirmity," as their desire was not only to encourage resignation where it was necessary, but to discourage it where it was not.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. DICKINSON then *moved* in line 16, after "or," to insert "permanent."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. DICKINSON said, the next Amendment of which he had given notice raised the question as to the amount of retiring allowances to Bishops and Archbishops. He could not admit the justice of the parallel sought to be established by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Beresford Hope). Judges came from a class in large and lucrative practice, and frequently sacrificed a large portion of their income on taking office. Bishops, on the contrary, came from a class not remarkable for large incomes; and the justification for the very high incomes which they received as Bishops was said to be that the emoluments were necessary for the office, not for the individual. A retired Bishop would have no social or public demands upon him calling for a large income; and during a long episcopacy he had many opportunities of providing for his family. The clause proposed that his allowance should amount to one-third of the income of the diocese, which he (Mr. Dickinson) thought was excessive. A larger portion of the revenues ought to remain with his successor, by whom the duties of the office were to be discharged. He further contended that there ought not to be different grades of retiring allowances for Bishops, but that they ought to be placed in the same category; they ought to have enough to maintain them in comfort, but not more. He should, therefore, move in line 27, to leave out from "such" to "pounds," in line 30, and insert "to the retiring Archbishop two thousand five hundred pounds, and to the retiring Bishop one thousand five hundred pounds." He first begged to move, in line 24, to leave out from "to" to "Bishop" in line 25.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that to give to this subject the full discussion which it might require would necessitate the introduction of a good deal of matter; but he would state shortly the view which the Government took, and he hoped it would commend itself to the Committee. Nothing was easier than to say that the Bishops, like the Apostles, ought to live according to evangelical poverty. Burke, however, had a very pregnant remark on that subject. He said, that undoubtedly all Bishops and clergy ought to have the mind of evangelical poverty, and to live in that spirit; but he added, although they might not be aware of it, that was equally the duty of the laity. And, certainly, throughout the New Testament, where the spirit of evangelical poverty was so strongly insisted upon, no clear distinction, that he had ever been able to find, was drawn between its application to the clergy and the laity. That, however, was one extreme view; the other was, that the Bishops should be treated as great Officers of State, the nearest analogy that could be found being that of a Judge. To the Judge, considering the relief which he gained from certain expenses, substantially three-fourths of his salary were given as a retiring allowance. According to the spirit of evangelical poverty, the Bishop, he supposed, ought to get no retiring allowance at all. But the line which the Government had drawn was one-third of his episcopal income. In framing a Bill of this kind it was absurd to leave out of sight all regard to the existing conditions of society. Parliament thought it desirable that there should be an Established Church, and also that very close relation should exist between the clergy and the rest of the community, with some relation also to rank. Further, it was justly thought of importance that there should be a married clergy, and hence the influence of the family upon the Bishop; and considerations of social status could not be excluded. The Government, accordingly, had taken the sum of £2,000 as that which would pretty fairly represent the minimum that would enable a person who had sat in the House of Lords to maintain his status with tolerable respectability; and they had introduced the provision as to one-third of the episcopal income as the general rule to which they wished this Bill to conform, being a very small allowance compared with that which was given to Judges. It might be perfectly true that the Archbishop of Canterbury, considered as a man, or considered as a gentleman, would be able to live upon the sum named in the Amendment. It must be remembered, however, that the Archbishop of Canterbury was the first subject after the Blood Royal, and that the Archbishop of York was the third. Under all the circumstances, he did not think the provision contemplated by the Bill for the members of the hierarchy could be regarded as extravagant, bearing in mind that many private gentlemen were in the enjoyment of fortunes of £20,000, £30,000, £40,000, £50,000, £60,000, and he knew not how many more thousands a year.

MR. WHITWELL asked whether the retiring allowance in the case of the Bishop of Winchester was to be calculated on the scale named in the Bill, or upon one-third of his former income, which amounted, he believed, to £15,000?

MR. GLADSTONE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) had stated that under the scale proposed the Bishop of Winchester would have a retiring allowance of £6,000 a year. He could not say he thought that an allowance of £6,000 a year was necessary for a gentleman who had occupied the position of a Bishop, but then it was not for the sake of individuals that this Bill had been brought forward. Its object was to get a see clear, in order that an efficient man might be put into it. Considering the subject from a pecuniary point of view, he might remark that he had not ascertained, as a fact, that the income of the Bishop of Winchester amounted to £18,000 a year; but, whatever it might be, he had no doubt that that excellent Prelate made a good use of it. Supposing the Bishop's income to be £18,000 a year, it was obvious that annual sum would become part of his private property as long as he lived and did not resign his see. Under this Bill, however, he would receive his pension of £6,000 a year. At the same time his successor would be paid the Parliamentary income of £7,000 a year, so that there would be an addition of £5,000 a year to the general funds of the Church applicable for incumbents. He trusted that this explanation would be satisfactory.

Mr. DICKINSON said, he was of opinion that the superannuation allowance ought not to be deducted from the income of the incoming Bishop.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that hon. Members should bear in mind that this was a measure to promote resignations; and, however anxious a Bishop might be to promote the welfare of his diocese, he could hardly be expected to reduce himself and his family to beggary. He knew that the Bishops, as a body of men, were torn to pieces by subscriptions. As the Prime Minister had truly remarked, the Church of England desired to have a married clergy; and how then was a Bishop or other clergyman who desired to devote a great portion of his income to charitable objects to make due provision for his family unless he insured his life? Probably, however, if his retiring allowance was made too small, he might be induced to let the insurance fall in, and thus his own family would be defrauded of their reasonable expectations. In a matter of this kind the highest generosity was the highest wisdom, and he trusted, therefore, that the Amendment would not be carried.

Mr. YOUNG asked whether it was intended that the outgoing Bishop should retain his seat in the House of Peers?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL explained that the Bill consisted of two parts. The first part had reference to the case of an absolute resignation, in which event the incoming Bishop would have full possession of the see, except that his revenues would be charged with the payment of his predecessor's pension. Of course, therefore, the retired Prelate would not continue to sit in the House of Lords. The second part related to the appointment of a coadjutor Bishop. In that case there would be two Bishops in the same see—one incapacitated, and the other doing the duty of the diocese. This was wholly different to the former case, because the coadjutor would not succeed to the see until the decease of the incapacitated Prelate.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he had now to propose an Amendment which would, he believed, meet the views of his hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Mr. Dickinson). If it were true that the Bishop of Winchester would, on resigning, be entitled to a pension of £6,000 a year, while the income of his successor would be only £7,000 a year, it would almost be an absurdity to make the pension payable out of the new Bishop's income. The House of Lords had accordingly provided that the £6,000 should be paid out of the common fund. But if the proviso became law the new Bishop of Winchester would, in the event of the present Bishop resigning, obtain his full salary without any charge upon it; whereas any person subsequently becoming Bishop of Winchester, would have his income charged with the payment of his predecessor's income. He, therefore, proposed that the proviso should be amended so as to run thus—

> "Provided that if in the case of the retirement of any Bishop appointed before the year 1832, such retiring allowance should exceed the sum of £2,000, the excess shall be paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners out of their common fund."

The result would be that in the event of the retirement of the Bishop of Winchester £7,000 would be saved to the Church.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. DICKINSON said, he desired to see sub-section 2, relating to episcopal residences, expunged from the clause. Every Bishop who resigned ceased to be a Bishop. ["No, no!"] It might not be so canonically, but, under this Bill, a Bishop who resigned was defunct as a Bishop. When a Bishop resigned, and a new Bishop was appointed, he maintained that the episcopal residence ought to go to the real Bishop, and not to be retained by the practically defunct one. Let them not seek to keep up the "sham" of having unreal as well as real Bishops. When a Bishop resigned he should retire into private life; and the episcopal residence attached to the see should pass to the actual Bishop who did the work of the diocese. He would, therefore, propose the omission of sub-section 2 from the clause.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. It was not intended by that portion of the Bill to lay down as a general rule that the retiring Bishop was to keep the episcopal residence. What was asked was that confidence should be given to the Advisers of the Crown up to this point, that if in a particular case they thought it expedient to assign an episcopal residence they should have power to do so. They would be responsible for that exercise of discretion, and if they exercised it wrongly they would be called to account as in regard to other matters where they had discretionary powers. If it were said—"Why should there be such confidence given to the Advisers of the Crown?" it was sufficient to reply that there might be some cases where it was desirable. He would take the case of the late Bishop Blomfield, who had been far gone in paralysis as the result of his almost superhuman and certainly his most indefatigable and untiring labours through a long and honourable episcopate. To have removed him in that condition from Fulham would have been cruel; and, at the same time, the term of his natural life could not, in all human probability, have been prolonged for more than a year or two. It was in view of such a case as that that this power was now asked for.

MR. WHITWELL said, he hoped the Amendment would be accepted. It might be very difficult for the incoming Bishop to obtain a residence as convenient as the episcopal residence attached to the see; and the new Prelate would hardly be deemed to be a true and properly appointed Bishop, if he were not invested with the residence hitherto appertaining to the bishopric.

MR. ACLAND said, he regarded that as partly a question of social feeling and personal convenience, and partly a question of practical efficiency. It might be a hardship to ask an aged Prelate, who was suffering from nervous debility, to clear out of his private study. On the other hand, he could not see what great hardship it would be to the incoming Bishop if he were asked temporarily to provide himself with a plain unostentatious town residence in a hired house in the scene of his labours until a more comfortable residence could be prepared for him.

MR. BOWRING said, he was in favour of leaving the clause as it stood.

MR. O. MORGAN said, that the case of the Bishop of Exeter, which had been repeatedly referred to, was not in point, as the Bishop did not reside at the episcopal palace in the City of Exeter, but in a splendid palace which had been built out of his funds at Torbay.

MR. MONK said, he thought that if they were dealing with deans, canons, or incumbents they would not insert a provision allowing a retiring dean to retain the deanery close to the cathedral, or a retiring incumbent to retain the rectory house, and he did not see why a different rule should be applied to a retiring Bishop.

MR. DICKINSON said, he hoped they would not have any more cases in future of Bishops sticking to their bishoprics until they could not remove from their episcopal residences. At all events, if such a case occurred again, that matter should be left to the good feeling of the incoming Bishop. They ought not to make a rule for exceptional cases, and why were Bishops to be treated differently from other men?

MR. GLADSTONE suggested to insert after "Her Majesty may" the words "upon special grounds," as likely to meet the difficulties of the case.

Words *inserted.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Proceedings to prove the incapacity of a Bishop).

MR. GLADSTONE proposed to strike out the word "any" in line 24, and insert the word "permanent."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. DICKINSON said, the clause read now "by reason of permanent mental infirmity." He proposed to introduce after "mental" the words "or physical," and to add after "infirmity" "or age." The Bill as it came down from the House of Lords provided for physical or mental infirmity, and, looking to what had occurred in certain dioceses, the House of Commons ought to proceed on that principle.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that a great many Members had waived their objection to the Bill on the understanding that it should be limited to mental infirmity. His hon. Friend was asking the Government to undertake one of the most difficult tasks of legislation—namely, while maintaining that regard for existing interests, which was always observed in this country, to arrange and adjust a machinery for ejecting a number of distinguished persons who held freeholds from offices with incomes of from £4,000 to £15,000 a year. That would be wholly beyond the means of the Government, and would be fatal to any enactment of the kind at the present period.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. DICKINSON moved, at the end of the clause, to add "and such certificate shall be deemed to be a representation within the second section." His object was that in a case of mental infirmity there should be appointed a real instead of a coadjutor Bishop.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Relative positions of Bishop and Bishop coadjutor).

Sir WILFRID LAWSON proposed, in line 6, after "privilege," to insert, "with the exception of a title to a seat in the House of Lords." If a Bishop was unfit for his episcopal duties, it was quite clear he was unfit for his legislative duties.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he would not dispute that *primâ facie* the Amendment appeared reasonable and proper. But if the retiring Bishop was not to retain his seat in the House of Lords, was the seat to pass to the coadjutor Bishop? ["No."] Well, then, the hon. Baronet was opening a very large constitutional question, and he (Mr. Gladstone) should prefer its being raised broadly and directly. It was certainly an inconvenience and an anomaly that a person not in his right mind should have a seat in the House of Lords. But if Prelates afflicted with mental infirmity were to be turned out of the House of Lords, what was to be done with lay Peers similarly situated? Moreover, if this strict rule was adopted, a little legislation would be necessary for the House of Commons too, for upon one occasion an hon. Gentleman walked quietly out of a lunatic asylum, came down to the House, and gave his vote upon a question which involved the life and death of a Ministry, as the hon. Baronet would doubtless remember, for he was in the House at the time.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he was sorry the recording of this vote against the right hon. Gentleman should affect his view of the question before the Committee.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he remembered another case in which a Gentleman was brought in on the Liberal side of the House in 1841, and voted on a question of vital importance, having no mind at all.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 6 to 10, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Application of the Act to Archbishops).

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE asked whether it was intended that in the case of an Archbishop the coadjutor would simply exercise the episcopal duty of the see attached to the archbishopric.

Mr. GLADSTONE answered in the affirmative.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 263.]

CANADA (RUPERT'S LAND) LOAN BILL.

[BILL 253.] SECOND READING.

(Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

Order for the Second Reading, read.

Mr. STANSFELD, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that as he understood the Bill was about to be opposed by the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) he would shortly remind the House of the history of the negotiations that had taken place. These negotiations began in 1865, when four of the Canadian Ministers came to this country to discuss with the Government of the day various questions connected with the confederation of the North American Provinces, among which came up this question with regard to the transfer of Rupert's Land to the Dominion of Canada. The Canadian Ministers said they were willing to treat for the transfer on the ground of an indemnity to be paid to the Hudson's Bay Company, provided that the loan to be raised for this purpose should be covered by an Imperial guarantee. This was agreed to by the Government of the day, and his right hon. Friend the present Secretary for War, who was then Secretary for the Colonies, wrote a letter to the Governor General of Canada, in which he distinctly promised that if negotiations were entered upon for the transfer of Rupert's Land from the Hudson's Bay Company, and if those negotiations should be successful and a loan were required to be raised under the sanction of an Imperial guarantee, the Government would then apply to the Imperial Parliament to grant the required guarantee. This was in June, 1865. The next step took place in March of the present year, when Sir Frederick Rogers by direction of Earl Granville wrote to the Canadian Ministers, Sir George Cartier and Mr. M'Dougall, who had come over to this country as Canadian delegates to negotiate for the transfer, that if the negotiations were successful the Government would, on their part, be prepared to fulfil the expectations held out in Mr. Cardwell's despatch of the 17th of June, 1865, and would propose that the Imperial Parliament should guarantee a loan of £300,000 for the purpose of completing the transfer. There were two Acts of Parliament passed having reference to this matter, to which he must now refer. The one was the Act passed in 1867, and which was known as the Confederation Act. The other was an Act which was passed through both Houses without discussion last year, to enable the Hudson's Bay Company to transfer Rupert's Land to the Dominion of Canada. The third section of that Act had attracted the attention of his hon. Friend (Mr. Monk), and it was that on which he understood his hon. Friend mainly based his opposition to the second reading of the Bill. By that section the Government were empowered to negotiate with the Hudson's Bay Company the terms upon which the latter should surrender their rights and territories to the Dominion of Canada; and it was provided that those terms should not be accepted until they had been embodied in a deed of the company, and in an Address to the Crown from both Houses of the Legislature in the Dominion; and there was also a proviso that those terms of agreement should impose no charge on the Consolidated Fund. The question raised the other night was whether the effect of that section was not to estop and prohibit the Government from proposing to guarantee a loan that Canada was seeking to obtain in order to enable her to carry out the terms of the agreement with the Hudson's Bay Company, and to estop and prohibit Parliament—if one Parliament could estop and prohibit any other Parliament—from assenting to such a guarantee being given. He need scarcely say that such could not have been the intention of the parties concerned. At the time that the Act was passed negotiations were being conducted upon the understanding that the Government for the time being would propose to that House that such a guarantee should be given. The true meaning of the proviso was merely that Parliament should preserve its liberty of action in the matter. The intention was nothing more than this—that in the deed which embodied the terms of the surrender of the Hudson's Bay Company, and in the Address to the Crown from the two Houses of the Dominion which embodied the acceptance, there should be nothing which in any way decided the question of a guarantee; that it should be left free to the Government to propose and to the House to agree or not to agree to the guarantee as they might think proper. In accordance with that stipulation in the Act of last year neither the draft deed of surrender, nor the Canadian Address contained any allusion to an Imperial guarantee. He made this proposal to the House not as one of the terms which had been agreed on in those documents, but to carry out the old arrangement; even if the House were to think it expedient to reject this proposition of the Government, still it could not be denied that the Government were adhering to their old pledges and those of their predecessors, and that was his justification for making the proposition confidently to the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Mr. MONK rose to move that the Bill be read a second time upon this day month. He regretted that the question was brought forward at this late period of the Session, and he must protest against the preliminary stages of measures of this importance being brought on—as had been the case with this Bill—at three o'clock in the morning or during the quarter-of-an-hour before six on a Wednesday afternoon, when it was impossible that they could be discussed. Under these circumstances, he did not think it necessary to apologize for taking the earliest opportunity that had offered itself of calling the attention of the House to this subject and of informing the British tax-payer of the nature of the additional financial burden which it was proposed by means of this measure to lay upon his shoulders. The sole ground upon which the right hon. Gentleman based this measure was, that in June 1865, a promise had been given by the Imperial Government to the Government of Canada that, in the event of the latter acquiring Rupert's Land by purchase from the Hudson's Bay Company, the former would propose to Parliament to guarantee a loan to enable that purchase to be carried into effect. He had two objections to offer to the Bill now before the House. In the first place, he objected altogether to the principle of guaranteeing loans to the colonies; and in the second place, he objected to this particular guarantee, which he believed to be opposed not only to the letter, but to the spirit, of the Rupert's Land Act of 1868. In objecting to the principle of guaranteeing loans to colonies, he claimed the support of the present Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, both of whom, at the time when the proposed loan for the Intercolonial Railway of Canada was before the House, had expressed strong objections to loans of that character. The Prime Minister said the general system of colonial guarantees had come into just discredit within the walls of Parliament, and that it was only in cases of the highest urgency that they should be granted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer went even further upon that occasion, and urged upon the House, if they were determined to grant the loan, to make at least some stringent provisions that the money should not be spent for other purposes—that it should not stick to the fingers of those who had to handle it. These were truly prophetic words. He wondered whether the Government was now satisfied, or whether the Law Officers of the Crown were satisfied with the temporary use made of that loan advanced for the Intercolonial Railway. His second objection was based on the words of the Rupert's Land Act, 31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 105. At the end of the third section there were these words—

> "Provided, further, that no charge shall be imposed by such Terms upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

These words were plain enough: yet, in the face of that proviso, it was now proposed to impose a charge on the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of making good the purchase of Rupert's Land. The negotiations which led to the purchase had been entered into in the present year, but he contended that the words in the Act of last Session ought to have prevented Her Majesty's Government from entering into such an arrangement as that to which this Bill was intended to give effect. He granted that the Government had only gone the length of making a promise, the fulfilment of which was subject to the pleasure of Parliament; but the promise so made must be fulfilled in spite of the words of the Act of last Session. It might be said that Parliament was at liberty to undo this year what it had done last, but he did not think that was a course which his right hon. Friend at the head of the Government would recommend. He hoped the House would have some further explanation of the matter. He begged to move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time upon that day month.

Sir CHARLES DILKE, in seconding the Amendment said, what he desired was that the House should have some general statement from the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, as to the principle on which the Government intended to act in respect of colonial grants. He believed that his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) did not mean to press his Amendment to a division if there was a clear and satisfactory understanding as to the policy which should guide the Government in future.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Monk.*)

MR. GLADSTONE said, he had heard the speeches of his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk), and his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) with great satisfaction. He thought it obvious that they might put out of their minds the question raised a short time ago with regard to the intermediate transactions under the Railway Loan Act. The only use they could make of it was to take care that in this Bill the provisions with regard to the appropriation were sufficient. The subject was only relevant to that extent. His hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester need not have been afraid that any complaint would be raised against him by the Government; but on behalf of the Government he had to say that they had introduced this Bill first, on the ground of faith, and, secondly, on the ground of policy. The ground of faith was sufficient to justify the Government in recommending the arrangement to the House; but he was far from saying that because the Government were bound in the matter, Parliament was bound in it also. He did not say that because the Executive Government had entered into an arrangement of this kind, Parliament ought, therefore, to sanction it. When the Government of this country entered into any arrangements of this nature, everyone knew that Parliament was supreme. All the Government could do was to undertake to make a representation to Parliament. It could not bind Parliament; but, at the same time, Parliament had always felt it was not desirable to needlessly call in question any discretion exercised by the Executive Government. Parliament had not been in the habit of calling in question the discretion of Government as to such matters, unless it appeared that there had been an absence of reason in the exercise of that discretion. Thinking now as he thought in 1865, he thought that the engagements entered into by the Government with Canada at that time were amply justified by reason and prudence. He did not recede from the expressions which had been referred to by his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester. He was ready to repeat them. Before 1865 the practice had been growing up of giving guarantees to the colonies for local and secondary objects. He contended that such guarantees ought not to be given except for objects of broad Imperial policy; but the purposes in regard to which the Government of Lord Palmerston, of which he and his right hon. Friend (Mr. Cardwell) were Membest, entered into the engagement with Canada were, in the highest and strictest sense, Imperial purposes. No one knew better than his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester that in former times the North American colonies were entangled in a vicious system of dependence on this country. The Government wished to engender in them a spirit of independence in financial matters. They wished to wind up the old system and see the North American colonies make a new start in colonial life; but we could not have extricated ourselves from the vicious system to which he had referred without paying for it. Neither in public nor in private life could one escape the consequences of former errors without some cost. To put an end to the old system once and for all, the Government made arrangements with Canada which bound them to ask Parliament to assist the North American Provinces with the Imperial credit for purposes well known to the House. That was not to be a beginning, but an end. The House would remember the great transition through which our loyal fellow-subjects in Canada were passing at the time. The proposal of the Government was based on grounds the sufficiency of which he hoped his hon. Friend who had moved the Amendment might be disposed to recognize. The Government were aware of their responsibility in the matter, but it was one which they felt themselves perfectly justified in assuming.

MR. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, he objected to the Bill for two reasons. The first was that he believed it to be in contravention of the third section of the Rupert's Land Act, which had been read to the House. From a despatch, dated June 17, 1865, and sent by the present Secretary for War (Mr. Cardwell), who was then Colonial Secretary, to Viscount Monck, it appeared that, at a conference between four representatives of the Canadian Government and as many Members of our Government, the Canadian

Ministers undertook to negotiate with the Hudson's Bay Company for the termination of their rights, on the condition that the indemnity, if any, should be paid by a loan to be raised by Canada under an Imperial guarantee—a proposal which was assented to on the part of the Crown; and, therefore, independently of the Rupert's Land Act, the Canadian Government had an assurance that the Government of Lord Palmerston would apply to Parliament to sanction a guarantee. In 1868 came the Rupert's Land Act, which empowered Her Majesty to receive the territory of the company, and hand it over to Canada, upon an Address from both Houses of the Canadian Legislature; and the Act contained words which secured us against any arrangement which could impose a burden upon the tax-payers of this country. The Act forbade such an arrangement, but the arrangement was made without it; and the Address of the Canadian Legislature expressed satisfaction that, in fulfilment of the expectation held out in the despatch of Mr. Cardwell, the English Government would be prepared to propose to Parliament an Imperial guarantee for the loan of £300,000 to be paid to the Company. It was perfectly clear that the letter of the Act was complied with, and its spirit departed from on a most vital point. It was clear the Canadian Government made the arrangement on the faith of the English proposing the guarantee; but if this guarantee were to be given, what confidence could be placed in the words of an Act of Parliament? The Act said an arrangement might be made to effect a certain object provided no charge was placed on the Consolidated Fund; and if such a charge were to be placed upon it Acts of Parliament would afford no security in the future. Some months ago a Gentleman, not now in the House, pointed out the clause, and said it was perfectly impossible that the guarantee could be given, and that was the impression it produced on all whose attention was called to it. The effect of it was to throw off their guard those who were opposed to guarantees, to prevent them from asking for Papers, and to deter them from calling attention to the subject. For these reasons he would support the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) if he went to a divison. There were other reasons which should induce the House to refuse the guarantee. If the territory ceded to Canada were really valuable, as it was represented to be, why should any charge be thrown upon us, and why should not the Canadian Government undertake the liability which the arrangement involved?

Mr. CARDWELL said, that having been a party to the arrangements of 1865, he felt bound to say a few words upon the subject. He shared to the utmost extent all the objections which were raised against colonial guarantees in general; but the question now was whether the arrangement of 1865, entered into for the purpose of bringing about a more wholesome state of things between us and our North American Provinces, was or was not an arrangement which the House would feel it expedient to ratify. In 1865 an intimation was received of that which had now become a reality—namely, the intention to form the Provinces of British North America into one great Confederation. This arrangement was made between four Canadian Ministers and those who represented the Government of that day, and the Report of it was then laid before Parliament, and the project of confederation was afterwards brought before Parliament by the Government of which Lord Carnarvon was Colonial Secretary in 1867. Parliament passed the Confederation Act, knowing the terms on which the Canadian Government had arranged to acquire the company's territory. Just before Parliament was dissolved, in 1868, the Rupert's Land Act was passed to supply a defect in the Confederation Act, which did not enable Her Majesty, without further statutory powers, to accept the surrender of the rights of the company and transfer them to Canada. He was cognizant of the proviso in the third clause when the Act was passing through Parliament, and he understood it was inserted with a purpose different from that suggested by the hon. Member who had just spoken. It was framed, as he understood, for the purpose of preventing anything being done under that Act which should commit Parliament. Having been most careful to carry out all that was involved in his own despatch, the Government felt that nothing ought to be done which could by implication fetter the freedom and discretion of Parliament. He believed that to have been the simple meaning of the clause; and he was fortified in that belief by other considerations. It was not in the power of Parliament to say that a future Parliament should be less free to do anything than their predecessors were. He held this to be the true and necessary construction of the proviso in the 3rd clause, and he did not think that anything of importance turned upon it. Coming back to the question of policy, he held that this arrangement, which was contemplated in 1865, and which the House was now asked to ratify, was an arrangement, not exclusively for the benefit and advantage of Canada, but was one which was largely beneficial to this country. We suffered from the inconvenience and disadvantage of exercising rights of sovereignty over one of the most inaccessible regions of the earth—the Hudson's Bay Territory. Continual embarrassment arose on account of the traversing of that extensive region by bodies of Indians, who entered from time to time the neighbouring American State of Minnesota; no settled Government was established there; and when he was Colonial Secretary there was a continual demand for creating the Hudson's Bay Territory into a Crown colony. A more undesirable proceeding on the part of the British Government there could not possibly be, for they had no advantage to expect from such an arrangement, which must necessarily have been attended with expense and risk; and, therefore, he was most happy to be a party to an arrangement by which—the sovereignty of this region remaining with the Crown—the rights which the Sovereign exercised were transferred to the Colonial Government. In return, all that we did was to give a guarantee for a loan of £300,000, and when the House went into Committee it would be seen that adequate security was taken in the Bill. He therefore recommended this measure to the House, not merely on the ground that the Government had pledged its faith in respect of the guarantee, for such a pledge would not bind Parliament—but on the ground of policy. As to pledges given by Government, he ventured to think that whenever Parliament thought the Government well advised in thus acting, it was good policy not to discredit the Crown and enfeeble the hands of the Executive Government by refusing to assent to that pledge. He did not put the case any higher with regard to the pledged faith of the Government, but he rested his support of this measure chiefly on the ground of policy. Canada had interests in this territory not possessed by ourselves, and in inducing her to undertake this duty, and thus relieving ourselves from a charge which in some form or other would have come upon us, he believed we had made an arrangement which was advantageous to the mother country—an arrangement cheaply purchased by the guarantee of a loan for so small a sum as £300,000.

COLONEL SYKES said, that these guarantees were decidedly injurious to our financial comfort, and we had ten or a dozen of them at this moment. Among the rest were the Greek Loan, the Sardinian Loan, the Russian-Dutch Loan, and several others, of which the tax-payers of this country were paying the interest, and of which they would have to pay the principal in the end. It was highly impolitic and injurious to the interests of the country that we should embark in these guarantees at all. The Prime Minister of the country had stated that the faith of the country was pledged to it; but the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down modified that by saying that it did not bind a future Parliament. No doubt, technically, it did not bind a future Parliament; but any such pledge given to a foreign Government, or to one of our colonies, was morally binding; and, therefore, reluctant as he was to give his consent to any further guarantees, still, in this case, he thought we could not help ourselves, and he felt bound to give his consent to the guarantee.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 65; Noes 10: Majority 55.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS) BILL.—[Bill 238.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen.*)

THIRD READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd August], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. W. M. TORRENS *presented* a Petition from the inhabitants of Bloomsbury in favour of a restriction being placed on the power of the Metropolitan Board of Works to sell more than one-twelfth of land to be taken from Finsbury Park.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that in rising to move that the Bill be re-committed, he had no wish to put an end to its progress. His object was to have the incidence of rating under Clause 22 defined more clearly. The sewers rate had been always regarded as a landlord's rate, and in the absence of a special agreement to the contrary, the tenant had always deducted it from his rent. If, however, the Bill passed in its present form it might happen that the small occupiers who held their houses from year to year would be called upon to pay the new rate that was to be substituted for the old one which was paid by the landlord. He wished to insert the following proviso after the word "board" in line 8—

> "Provided always, That such first mentioned proportion shall be assessed and raised in like manner, and subject to the same provisons as the sewers rate, to be made under the Act of the eighteenth and nineteenth Victoria, chapter one hundred and twenty."

He therefore moved that the Bill be re-committed.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House in respect of a proviso to Clause 22, and a new Clause for restricting the sale of park lands,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, that if the Bill were re-committed, he should like to ask the opinion of the House on a proposal similar in object to, though somewhat different in terms from, that which he submitted to the Committee a few days ago. He desired to take from the Metropolitan Board of Works the power of selling or letting any greater portion than 1-12th part of the lands vested in the Board for the purposes of any park within the metropolis. The Committee decided by a majority of 6 that a clause to that effect should be introduced into the Bill; but that clause was subsequently struck out by a majority of 23. The supporters of the proposal had been told they were making a claim on behalf of particular metropolitan parishes to have a new tax imposed on the whole community for the benefit of local interests. That assertion had been strenuously denied, though the majority appeared to think that the allegation was well-founded. It should be borne in mind, however, that the preponderance of unofficial Members was in favour of the proposal, which was negatived by a majority comprising 26 hon. Gentlemen who held Office. Twelve metropolitan Members, including the two Members for Middlesex, voted in favour of his proposal, and but one solitary representative of the metropolis recorded his vote against it. Up to the present time there had not been a single indication, whether by Petition, public meeting, or remonstrance in the Press, that the inhabitants in the metropolis were adverse to the proposal. He might remark that the Act of 1857, which was promoted by the Board of Works itself, set forth in the Preamble that the plans, maps, and specifications of the lands about to be taken for the two parks at the East-end of the metropolis, at the north and south sides of the river respectively, had been lodged with the Clerk of the Peace for Middlesex, and had been approved by Her Majesty's Commissioners of Public Works. It was thus stated beforehand what the arrangements were to be, and the matter was not left to the mere discretion of the Board of Works. The 8th clause, indeed, stated the exact number of acres —250—purchased for the parks. The Act stated that when the purposes of the Act had been sufficiently accomplished, and the lands had been imparked, the Board of Works should be at liberty to dispose, at most, of one-twelfth part of the land it had acquired for the park. Let the House, then, hold the Board of Works to its bargain, and to the *litera scripta* of the Act which had been passed. Let it now enact by a clause that that Board should not have power at most to sell more than that proportion of the lands in their diminished area which it was not empowered by the Act of 1857 to sell out of the greater area. It was a mockery to tell the districts affected that they might bring in a private Bill next year. The part of the land which the Board of Works proposed to sell for building purposes, and which the President of the Poor Law Board argued the other night was worth £76,000, was the best part, the cream, in fact, of the whole. Parliament gave that to the people of the East-end of the metropolis. Let it keep it for them, and not tell them it was willing to sanction bad faith. It was not fair or just towards the inhabitants of those crowded districts to deprive them of almost their only means of obtaining healthful recreation and breathing space. He asked on their behalf for nothing unreasonable from the House. Never had a greater misrepresentation fallen from the lips of man than had fallen — unintentionally, of course—from those of the Prime Minister, when that subject was last under discussion. The right hon. Gentleman had been led most erroneously to believe he was justified in saying that that was a project to levy a new tax on the metropolis at large for the benefit of two localities. He denied in every sense which language permitted that the fact was so. Those two localities did not ask 1*s.* either from the public Treasury or from the metropolis at large. The Board of Works was the common trustee for the interests of the whole of London; it had taken its large powers under certain stipulations in an Act of Parliament; and it was not at liberty to go back from those stipulations now. Parliament had created the power of that Board, and was bound under the highest dictates of political honour to see those whom he represented out of that difficulty, and to show that it had just as much regard for their interests, although they might be comparatively powerless, as if they really composed one of the great parties or factions in the State. He therefore hoped the House would interpose its authority between the inhabitants of the East-end of London and an irresponsible body, and insist on inserting a clause in that Bill literally carrying out the stipulation of the Act of 1857, by which the Board of Works was not empowered to sell more than one-twelfth part of any land vested in it for the purpose of forming any public park in the metropolis.

MR. AYRTON said, his hon. Friend had, no doubt, exhibited great pertinacity in pressing his views on the consideration of the House, and he had not hitherto thought it necessary to enter into a discussion of the accuracy of the statements his hon. Friend had made to induce the House to adopt his conclusion. He had not done so because he regarded his hon. Friend's Motion as wholly inopportune, if not entirely irregular; for it was an attempt to introduce into a general measure a clause for the benefit of his hon. Friend's constituents—a proceeding contrary to the spirit of the Standing Orders of the House applicable to Public Business, and also of those applicable to local business, which declared that where they sought to alter the provisions of a local Act for the benefit of a particular locality they could do that only by private Bill, when they had to make their statements of fact before a Committee upstairs, which decided impartially. The speech they had just heard afforded an excellent illustration of the wisdom of that rule, and the necessity of adhering to it; because, otherwise, they would have an hon. Member, who himself knew nothing of the subject, inspired by anybody, by any of his constituents, by vestrymen and agitators, who gave him instructions, on which he was, of course, compelled to act without having the means of obtaining authentic information. That was the unfortunate position in which his hon. Friend had been placed. [MR. W. M. TORRENS: No!] Well, let them see what were the facts. The vestry of Islington, through their clerk, promoted a Bill to have a park, in which they proposed that the Government should make a grant of £50,000 or £60,000 in aid of their scheme. By that Bill they proposed to get 300 and odd acres of land, and gave to their own commissioner an unlimited power of selling any part of the land to be so taken. The House of Commons, in the most unmistakable manner, in a full House, by a very large majority, condemned that project, and no further progress in it was made. But the Metropolitan Board of Works introduced a Bill of a different kind, by which it was proposed that Board should have a discretionary power to make a park as large as they should think fit. [Mr. W. M. TORRENS: No!] He had the Bill there; his hon. Friend had not got the Bill, but only the Act, and probably he had never seen the Bill. The Bill proposed that the Metropolitan Board of Works should make a park as large as they might think fit, within the limits of their compulsory powers to take land, which went to the extent of 250 acres. Under that Bill the Metropolitan Board of Works proposed to sell eighty acres of the land. Therefore, when his hon. Friend set up his theory that the Metropolitan Board of Works adopted the principle in the face of the public that they would deal with only twenty acres out of 250, the fact was they proposed to deal with eighty acres, and that quantity they were to sell at their discretion out of the land they were to take, which was not to exceed 250 acres. His hon. Friend told the House there was a public engagement not to sell more than twenty acres. What happened was this—The landed proprietor appeared before the Committee, as he had a right to do, to oppose the Bill, and said—"You shall not compulsorily take my land from me to sell eighty acres again. You shall take only twenty acres more than you propose to make into a park, because you have no right to dispossess me of my land in order to speculate with it." He carried his opposition further, and got a clause introduced providing that the land which was re-sold should be re-sold to himself. So the compact was between the owner and the Board of Works, that they might take twenty acres more than they intended to use for the park, but that they should sell it back to him. And how? Why, ten years after the park was made, at the improved value it would then have acquired; so that they would then have a means of indemnifying themselves, in part at least, for the expense of making the park. His hon. Friend had represented that to be a compact between the Board of Works and the public that the Board should be allowed to sell only a twelfth part of the land. The Bill and the Act, as passed, gave the Board of Works a discretionary power to make a park as big or as little as they pleased within the limits of their compulsory authority to purchase. It was not a compulsory Bill as regarded the Board; it was only a permissive Bill enabling them to take the land. After the Board of Works had got the Bill it had to consult the opinions of the rate-payers of the metropolis, who were so adverse to embarking in the enterprize, that the Board for six years did nothing, and they were not bound to do anything at all. They had an absolute discretion in the matter; although, of course, being elected, they were responsible to their constituents, the rate-payers. At the end of six years they appointed a surveyor to consider what should best be done to carry out the Act. The surveyor investigated the value and convenience of properties in the north of London, and made a report—which he then held in his hand—suggesting that they should buy a certain property; and as an inducement to them to buy it the surveyor called their attention to the fact that they would be able to appropriate and sell twenty acres. That report gave the value of the twenty acres on the conditions under which they were likely to sell them; and the surveyor pointed that out as a source from which they would be recouped. The Metropolitan Board proceeded upon the faith of that report, and made the purchase. When the Metropolitan Board had done so, and spent the money of the rate-payers, his hon. Friend now said that the House ought not to proceed with this Bill unless the rate-payers of the metropolis would make a present of land to his constituents. [Mr. W. M. TORRENS: I never said anything of the sort.] Not in so many words, but it came to that. There could be no greater breach of faith than such a transaction would involve. Now, what was the solution of the difficulty? His hon. Friend's constituents were most anxious to have a larger park than the rate-payers were willing to give them, and therefore he wanted to alter the law in order that his constituents might get the benefit. But was the House to stop the progress of a Bill for the benefit of the inhabitants of the metropolis generally until this concession was made to his hon. Friend's constituents? His hon. Friend knew very well that the Metropolitan Local Government Act was passed on this principle, that the Metropolitan

Board should alone regulate the expenditure to be paid by the rate-payers at large, because they are elected by the rate-payers at large; but if any district thought that a particular improvement was more for its own benefit than that of the metropolis it would have to pay for that improvement; but it might apply to the Metropolitan Board to know how much the district and how much the metropolis should pay. When an improvement was made in the City, for instance, it was usual for them to say to the Metropolitan Board—"We will pay two-thirds provided you pay one-third." That was constantly done. And now his hon. Friend had presented a Petition from his constituents, saying that they wanted a bigger park. By all means let them have it. They could buy the twenty acres from the Metropolitan Board, subject, of course, to the owner's right of pre-emption. As far as the Metropolitan Board were concerned, those who represented the district had only to say—"We want more land than the rate-payers are willing to give us, and we are ready to pay for it." That was the proper solution of the difficulty, and it was in the hands of the vestry which his hon. Friend represented. The parish of Islington was very rich, and its rates were very low. He submitted to the House that they would encourage the very worst principle if at the end of the Session, when Bills might be delayed, they were to recognize the right of Members to come down and ask for grants to their constituents out of the money of the rate-payers at large.

MR. MACFIE said, that Liverpool, with about one-sixth of the population of London, and not at all so wealthy, was expending about £1,000,000 on parks for the people, and the whole population were benefited, though these parks were distant about two miles from the central and more populous portion of the town. And now they were told by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) that this park was for the benefit of the East-end of London. He had been accustomed to live near lakes, but what would lakes be if they were huddled behind great houses? Let not the Seven Sisters Road be shut out from the park by houses, but let the people there have a sight of the cheerful omnibuses and carriages passing by. He hoped that for once this Session the Government would be left in a minority.

COLONEL SYKES said, the accumulation of words had mystified the question very much. He had thought he had understood it, but he perceived he had something to learn. However, the question appeared to him to be this. It was thought it would be for the benefit of a certain crowded part of the metropolis noted for its poverty and wretchedness that a certain portion of land should be bought for a park—he cared not what the number of acres were or by what means they were to be got, they were to give fresh air, and the means of recreation for the people. An Act of Parliament was passed for the purpose, and had his hon. Friend the Member for Finsbury (Mr. W. M. Torrens) quoted rightly from the Act or not, that only one-twelfth of the land could be sold? If he had, and if the portion of land was only 120 acres, then the Metropolitan Board would have only ten acres to sell, and not twenty; but, honestly, if the land was bought for a park, it should be devoted to a park.

SIR WILLIAM TITE said, that the original Bill gave the Metropolitan Board power to buy 230 or 250 acres, he did not remember which; and for a long time they found it very difficult to get land at all. At last they obtained 120 acres. Originally the price was to be £500 an acre for 250 acres, but the Government were to find half the money ["No, no!"] He said "Yes." He heard Lord Palmerston, then standing in his place, say that the Government would pay £60,000; but the House did not allow him to carry his intention out. Well, the Metropolitan Board had to buy the land themselves, and they bought these 115 or 120 acres. And now they were going to sell twenty acres; the Act of Parliament did not empower them to sell more, and there were two plots—one fronting the road, the other fronting the railway, but the only point in dispute was as to ten acres abutting on the road. The parties who had opposed their buying it in the first instance had now purchased the land opposite and wanted to have the benefit of the frontage which the park gave. Therefore, they came and opposed this Bill. These persons said—"Don't take the frontage from us and prevent us from making a great deal of money by it. Don't sell it and don't build on it yourselves." Now, nobody in the world wanted the money more than the Metropolitan Board. And while his hon. Friend on the one hand said—"Don't increase the rates, and don't add another shilling to our burdens," he also said he would not let the Metropolitan Board have the means of recouping themselves to the extent of £70,000, which they might without doing harm to anybody. The Metropolitan Board had the power to sell the land, and had the right to sell it, and to interpose to prevent them would be most unfair.

MR. C. DENISON wished to say that, although he had voted with the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. W. M. Torrens) the other night, the explanation offered by the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Ayrton) and the hon. Member for Bath had changed his opinion on the subject.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 3rd August.*]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1868 was £48,534,412; the total of the direct claims upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium was £8,957,464; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £32,362,402; the value of Stores supplied from England was £970,926; the charges in England were £5,710,880; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,540,435, making a total charge for the same year of £49,542,107; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £1,007,695; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £602,462, and that including that charge the excess of Expenditure over Income was £1,610,157."

MR. J. B. SMITH remarked upon the continued increase of expenditure in India, and complained that, although at the time money was wanted to make railways in India, it was promised that their construction would be followed by a reduction in the Army, the cost of the force was still £16,000,000, notwithstanding troops could now be transported from one end of the Empire to the other in as many days as it formerly took months. A very hard-hearted Chancellor of the Exchequer was wanted in India, and he hoped Sir Richard Temple would bring about a more satisfactory state of affairs than his predecessors had. He approved the principle laid down by the right hon. Member for Devonshire (Sir Stafford Northcote), that accounts relating to reproductive works should be kept distinct, and was glad to hear that future accounts would be framed on the principle of keeping ordinary and extraordinary expenditure separate. As it was now proposed to borrow upon these public works, he suggested that the loans should be called Public Works Loans, and that an effort should be made to raise the money or some portion of it in India. The people of India would see that the money was spent in works of great benefit to themselves, and he believed the investment would become popular among them. He had for years past advocated the construction of these works by borrowed money, and ventured to assert that India might be covered with every necessary public work without cost. The Erie Canal, one of the greatest works in the world, had been made without costing the State 1*s.*; it had been constructed for small vessels in the first place with borrowed money; the tolls had paid off the loan and enlarged the canal, and now it was proposed to make a ship canal of it; and all through the transaction, the policy of the State had been to attract traffic by a reduction of toll. Manchester, in like manner, had been supplied with water and gas without costing the people a ¼*d.* in taxation; and the whole of the Liverpool Docks had been constructed on the same principle. The advantages to the inhabitants in each case were, of course, immense; and India might be similarly benefited without cost to the tax-payers if public works were constructed with money borrowed on State credit and the security of tolls; for while the outlay on public works would be re-paid by the revenue derived from them, wealth would be 1,000 times increased by increased production. In the course of an interesting discussion a short time ago, by the Society of Engineers, upon irrigation in India and Spain, Mr. Allan Wilson, from the Madras Presidency, described the extraordinary magnitude of the works in that part of India before our conquest. It had been estimated there were in fourteen of the principal irrigated districts of the Madras Presidency, upwards of 43,000 tanks and channels in repair, besides about 10,000 out of repair, having probably 30,000 miles of embankments and 300,000 separate masonry works. Colonel Baird Smith stated that the Ponacry tank in Trichinopoly had an embankment of thirty miles long and an area of sixty to eighty square miles, and Mr. Wilson expressed surprise that the Government had neglected these great works, and allowed large rivers to flow into the sea unused for agricultural purposes. Besides the profit to the State in the way of increased commercial prosperity, canals were accounted valuable for sanitary purposes. Mr. Login, an engineer of the Ganges Canal, said the strong argument in favour of canals is, that they are calculated to prevent those awful visitations which sweep off hundreds of thousands by starvation. It was estimated that the Ganges Canal prevented the death of as many thousands as perished in Orissa, and in the next year, 1866-7, the canal repaid to the country more than its total cost, while it was the means of feeding little short of 2,500,000 of people. It appeared that the water in the canals in the Madras district was comparatively clear, and though the current was slight no great deposit was formed; but the water in the Ganges was full of mud, and a rapid current was there needed to prevent the accumulation of sediment. Now, it was proposed to make some of the Ganges Canal works on the same level as those of Madras; but it was the opinion of the engineers to whom he had just referred, among whom was that eminent authority, Mr. Hawksley, that such a course of proceeding would be altogether in error. He therefore trusted that the Indian Government would not spend £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 on such an important undertaking without making further inquiry. In proof of the benefits derived from irrigation he instanced the large profits yielded by several works of that kind, and he thought that such results ought to encourage the Indian Government to persevere in making works of irrigation. Sir A. Cotton said the opinion had been expressed that no great profit can be gained on works of irrigation for many years to come. His experience of profits were—

	Cost.	Profits.	Per cent.
Godavery ...	£337,000 ...	£160,000...	45
Kistreah ...	191,000 ...	29,000...	15
Upper Calleroon Anicut ...	24,000 ...	64,000...	270
Lower Calleroon	34,000 ...	52,000...	150

The total aggregate profits on the Madras works, over and above 4 per cent interest, was £2,820,000 on a total cost of £560,000, or five times the cost of the works after paying interest and cost of repairs. The Indian Government wanted revenue, and it was very clear that the most effectual mode of obtaining it was by irrigating their lands and thereby increasing their rental. Mr. Allan Wilson, contrasting the difference between dry and irrigated land, stated that of fourteen Ryotwaire districts of Madras, 2,000,000 acres irrigated yielded a revenue of £1,500,000; 25,000,000 acres of dry land only £2,000,000; while, if it had been irrigated, it would have produced upwards of £18,000,000. As regarded the gain to the cultivator, independently of the certainty of reaping a crop, irrigated lands yielded a crop of 20 rupees an acre; dry land, 6 rupees an acre. So that the ryot was better able to pay 3 rupees per acre for irrigated land than 1 rupee for dry land. If the Government wanted to increase the revenue and at the same time benefit the cultivator, they had only to promote irrigation. He was glad to learn that the Government of India were taking measures to promote the growth of forests in their territory, for the manure which ought to be used to enrich the land was to a great extent dried and used as fuel. In alluding to the growth of cotton, he observed that twenty-five years ago certain persons in the manufacturing districts of this country entertained great apprehensions in consequence of those districts being mainly dependent for the cotton they needed upon one source of supply. At that time 75 per cent of the raw cotton used in this country came from America, and at the time of the occurrence of the civil war the proportion supplied by America had increased to 85 per cent. In 1848 the present President of the Board of Trade moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the growth of cotton, and the Committee, after investigating the matter, were satisfied that a large quantity of excellent cotton could be obtained from India. In the following year his right hon. Friend moved that a Commission should be sent out to India further to inquire into the subject; but the East India Company refused to afford any assistance in prosecuting the inquiry. However, the manufacturers of Lancashire felt the importance of obtaining information on that head so greatly that the Manchester Chamber of Commerce sent out a commissioner of their own, who, though he unfortunately died, left behind him sufficient evidence to prove that the desired object of procuring supplies of cotton from India might be attained. It was represented to the Government from time to time that, without Government assistance, it was impossible for India to produce what was wanted—namely, a good quality of cotton; but the reply made to that representation was that it was contrary to the principles of political economy for the Government to interfere in such a matter, and that when there was a demand there would be a supply. That statement was true as regards most countries, but it did not apply to India. In America the cotton was produced by men of capital, but in India it was the production of a miserable set of ryots; and one might as well look for improvements in agriculture from Irish cottiers as expect improvements in the cultivation of cotton from the class of cultivators he had referred to. The Government said it was contrary to political economy to do anything in this matter. But there was as great a demand for tea as cotton, yet that demand brought no tea from India until the Government, acting upon the economical principle, wisely tried the experiment of planting tea gardens, and exhibiting to the natives the practicability of extensively growing it, and now they succeeded in growing tea of better quality than was grown in China. There was now a large growth of tea in India, and very probably it would be exceedingly extended. Then, there was the article of quinine. It fetched fabulous prices, but no one ever thought of growing it till, on the recommendation of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), plants were introduced in large quantities, and now India not only supplied itself, but in all probability quinine would become an article of considerable export. If the Government could do all this, why not try experiments in the growth of cotton? But Government had always treated Lancashire people as merely seeking their own interests. Now, they did seek their own interests undoubtedly, but they could not do so without seeking also the interests of India. During the American War the total exports from India amounted to £67,000,000, and of that £34,000,000 consisted of cotton. The total exports now were £50,000,000, and he supposed they would have to pay some £30,000,000 this year for cotton. Was not India, then, interested in the growth of cotton, seeing that one-half of her exports consisted of that article? They had been imploring the Government for years, and at length they had got a Cotton Commissioner. They were very fortunate in his appointment, for the gentleman appointed had his heart in the work. He went to the province of Candeish and saw they were using a very inferior kind of seed. He imported seed from Berar, where the best cotton in India was grown. The very first year after sowing this seed the sowers obtained so much more for it as paid the price of their rent twice over. He said, then, that the Cotton Commissioner had been a great benefit to India. But he must warn the Indian Government that they would have competition to encounter. America would still grow cotton, and of a better quality than India, unless India bestirred herself. America was about to import large numbers of Chinese labourers, and India could not keep the valuable cotton trade she possessed unless she bestirred herself. The great disadvantage of India was that, while America grew 500 lb. per acre, India grew only 50 lb. per acre. India had also this disadvantage, that, for want of roads, the cotton had formerly to be carried on the backs of bullocks from Berar to Bombay for shipment, a distance of 500 miles. India had now railways and the finest rivers in the world. The expense of the conveyance of cotton from Berar to Bombay on bullocks was 2*d.* per lb., by railway 1*d.* per lb., and by the Godavery, which flowed through the centre of the best cotton-fields, half-a-farthing per lb. The Government of

India must, therefore, bestir themselves. Not many years ago we were reproached with the charge that if we were driven from India the only memorial we should leave behind would be pyramids of empty beer-bottles. That reproach no longer existed. We should now leave behind us ever-enduring monuments of our greatness and beneficence in the magnificent public works already existing, which, with those the Government projected, would confer greater benefits on the people of India than were recorded of the conquerors of any age or nation. The late Mr. Cobden could never be persuaded to take part in Indian affairs; his answer always was we had no business there. Well, but we were there; we had taken upon ourselves a great responsibility, and it was our duty to face it; we had destroyed the established Governments of the country; and if we left India now, anarchy and confusion must be the result. The English Government was the best that India ever possessed, and life and property were never so secure as under our sway; nevertheless a foreign yoke was always hateful. Let us endeavour, by just and beneficent rule, to make our Government a blessing to our Indian fellow-subjects.

MR. BAZLEY said, he had listened with great interest to the very able speech of the Under Secretary for India on Tuesday last, but he must deplore that so much procrastination occurred in all that concerned India. He hoped that in future Sessions the Indian Budget would be brought forward earlier. No doubt the accounts quoted by the hon. Gentleman were accurate, but they should be more distinct. He agreed in the suggestion that there ought to be an investment account for reproductive public works, and indulged the hope that a permanent source of revenue would arise from judicious Government investments in railways, canals, and irrigation. The cost of these works should be the foundation of the proposed investment account. He believed it would be found that the increase in our Indian expenditure, since the period of the Mutiny, was little less than £20,000,000 per annum, and this amounted to a heavy burden on the people of India. He approved very much of the statements which had been made in "another place" with regard to public works, and was much pleased to find that an eminent authority had said that 30,000 miles of railway were necessary for India. That country had 4,000 miles of railway, constructed at a cost of £80,000,000 sterling; Great Britain had 14,000 miles of railway, which cost £600,000,000; while America had already 40,000 miles of railway, which cost £550,000,000; and there was a prospect that before long the railway investments in the United States would amount in value to £1,000,000,000. It was clear that India was still lamentably behind Great Britain in railway enterprize. He was glad to see that railways in that country would be constructed in future at the sole cost of the Indian Government, because he believed there would be great national economy in making railways a portion of public works. We spent £100,000,000 during the Crimean War, and why should not our capitalists, in the cause of peace and industry, raise £100,000,000 for Indian railways? The Government might as well engage in these works as depute a railway company to execute them. He would go further, and advise the Government to buy up the lines already opened in India, and establish one uniform public railway system for that country. He believed that if that course had been pursued in England the railways would have been more cheaply constructed, there would not have been so many duplicate lines, and there would have been greater convenience, combined with a lower rate of charge. He did not see why the public works should not become a source of permanent and enduring revenue. The establishment of an Agricultural Board would probably give a stimulus to the productions of India, which could send us three or four times her present amount of exports. Her coffee was of an improved quality, owing to the application of manure to which the soil of India had hitherto been a stranger. Her growth of cotton could be largely increased. Unhappily great distress existed at present among the cotton interests in the manufacturing districts, hence the necessity of still greatly increased supplies of raw cotton. He had every reason to believe that the losses on fixed investments in the cotton trade amounted to £30,000,000 sterling, and the losses on floating capital to an equal amount; so that by the disasters connected with the cotton trade that branch of industry had sustained a total loss equivalent to £60,000,000. A continuance of the present state of depression, coupled with the emigration of the operatives, would go far to remove the trade itself to some more prosperous country. He deplored the existence of the protective system in America; but, with all its evils, the manufacturers in America were able to keep their mills going, while we could only work ours for a very limited period. He gave the present Government full credit for endeavouring to bring about a healthier state of things as far as this could be accomplished by legislation. With that object in view he trusted they would persevere in their efforts to develop not only the cotton trade in India, but remunerative traffic in the various products of the soil.

MR. C. DENISON said, he regretted that the discussions upon Indian subjects were always deferred to so late a period of the Session that Members were utterly wearied and worn out, and unable to give to the matter in hand that attention which its importance demanded. If it were true that this year upwards of forty Members had come down to hear the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for India, he hoped that might be taken as an augury of good for the future; the subject only required to be popularized to become full of interest to Members. Some improvements had been made, but still he thought the accounts of Home expenditure, as placed upon the table this year, were not satisfactory or easily intelligible; it would be much better if they were classified, as was done with the Indian expenditure, under different heads. A separate Financial Statement and Budget for the public works would also, he thought, be highly desirable. The ordinary expenditure, as laid down by Sir Richard Temple—the permanent guaranteed interest on railway capital, and the extraordinary reproductive expenditure together made up £10,000,000, and it would surely be interesting to the House to know how these £10,000,000 were spent, and to what extent the works themselves were reproductive, With regard to the Customs, he hoped that the Government might before long see its way to a reduction of the export duty of almost every Indian product. The manner in which the salt duty was levied was far from satisfactory. It produced a net revenue of £5,500,000; but the proportion of that which fell to the Punjaub and the North-west Provinces was not more than £1,400,000. As regarded the revenue from opium, he hoped the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) and those who thought with him would bring forward their objections in some shape admitting of the question being thoroughly talked out; he should then be prepared to meet them. On that point he fully agreed with Sir Richard Temple, who declared that—

> "If the Chinese will have opium, they may as well have it first-rate from us as second-rate at home, and they may as well have it taxed as untaxed."

The Chinese would have opium: there was no doubt about that; and if that was the case, he did not see why a profitable article was not to be supplied to the Chinese market. At the present moment, however, it was idle to discuss the question; we simply could not do without the revenue from opium. If that stopped from any cause, all the expenditure upon public works must cease at the same moment. The postal service in India ought to be a source of revenue; but, at present, there was a deficit, and this could hardly be regarded as in process of diminution, for the Government had lately doubled the minimum weight of letters to be carried without increasing the tariff. The telegraph entailed a net expenditure of £200,000 and upwards, and he wished to ask the Government what portion of this outlay belonged to India proper, as this was not shown in the accounts? There was another item as to which explanation was desirable; £68,000 were put down for a small arms manufactory in this country. He wished to know where the machinery was erected for making the small arms ammunition for India, and also what was the total estimated cost of the gunboats for Bombay Harbour? The hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith) had expressed his belief that matters might be so arranged that the public loans for the public works of India might become a favourite investment with the natives, but it was a remarkable fact that out of the £87,000,000 that had been subscribed for Indian railways, only £1,000,000 was held by the natives; and that out of the £100,000,000 of which the Indian public debt consisted, only £15,000,000 were held by them, scarcely any portion of that sum having been taken up since the Mutiny of 1856-7. There were two reasons explanatory of that fact. In the first place, the usual rate of interest in India was 12 per cent, or more than double that offered by the Government; and, in the second place, the confidence of the natives in Government securities had been shaken in consequence of the Government having confiscated that portion of their debt which was the property of the rebels. Upon the much-debated subject of Indian railway finance the hon. Member for London (Mr. Crawford) the other day had taken great pains to point out the great injustice that had been done the guaranteed railway companies by the recent despatch of the Indian Government, in which they were charged with mismanagement and extravagance. It appeared to him (Mr. C. Denison) that the East Indian Railway was well deserving of the confidence of the Government. It was, however, only fair to state that the despatch had not been drawn up for presentation to Parliament, or as an attack upon the railways, but had been merely intended to justify the Government in inaugurating the new system which was to be pursued with regard to them. In his opinion, however, that despatch did not show the existence of such a state of things as would justify the Indian Government in taking the whole control of the Indian railways into their own hands henceforth. He doubted, in the first place, the capability of the Government of India to undertake the management of these enormous works to anything like the extent which had been foreshadowed by the Secretary of State, and, beyond that, he had a great horror of the management of the existing lines and of the 10,000 miles of new railways which it was proposed to make being placed in the hands of one high central department. On the other hand, it might be most advantageous for the Government of India to take in hand certain railways, for the purpose of showing the companies what economy and good management might produce. But that was a very different thing from taking possession of lines of which 4,500 miles were open and 2,000 were in progress, and which gave employment to 3,000 Europeans and to 25,000 natives. They had had some experience of Government management in the case of the Ganges Canal, and that was not calculated to inspire confidence in their management of the railways. The Home Government, under the advice of the Governor General, had very wisely within the last few weeks authorized the Government of India to undertake the construction of about 800 miles of railway, and he should watch the progress of those lines with great interest. If the Government could bring down the cost of construction from £17,000 to £12,000 per mile, and could materially reduce the cost of the working expenses they would do much towards justifying the charges they had brought against the guaranteed companies. The Committee, however, should recollect that when these railways were first inaugurated the British people had but little confidence in public works in India as a remunerative investment for capital, and, therefore, by removing that distrust the guaranteed companies had amply served their purpose, however extravagant they might have been in their capital accounts, and however much they might have neglected economy in their working expenses. That there was a remarkable difference between the amount of the working expenses of the various lines was true; but that was largely accounted for by the fact that while some companies had coal in their own districts others had to import Welsh coal at the cost of 60*s*. or 70*s*. per ton. The Government would do well to persevere in the course they had indicated during the last month, which was to authorize the construction of a certain number of miles of railway under the superintendence of their own officers, and to encourage the old and new companies only on the understanding that the terms of their agreement should be altered so as to permit the Government, when there was extravagance in the capital account, to take the lines under their own control, while all surplus over the 5 per cent which was guaranteed was to be equally divided between the company and the Government. If that course were adopted he could not see what objection there could be to leaving the lines in the hands of the companies. He did not propose to enter deeply into the subject of the irrigation works, but he might observe that the Government of India proposed to expend in this very year not less than £2,500,000 upon them over and above the amount appropriated to the ordinary public works, a sum which, in fact, they could not spare in any one single year. Certainly, he would not encourage an unlimited expenditure on those works although they were reproductive. It had been found by experience that in India such works took a longer time to be reproductive than they did in this country. He believed that in India it took from ten to fifteen years for such works to recoup the capital expended on them. He thought those who urged an enormous expenditure were not really good friends to India, and he thought also that the Government of that country must always keep a firm control over its finances, otherwise the credit on which they were now so proud of borrowing at 4½ or 5 per cent, would soon disappear. He did not believe in the power of the Government to go on for a number of years borrowing money at 4½ per cent. He was sure that the noble Lord who now filled the post of Governor General and the Indian Government at home would make it their study to consider Indian subjects from an Indian point of view. They should do everything to encourage the flow of surplus capital into India, and he agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) that England had done more for India than India had done for England—that was to say, India had absorbed more, much more, of the precious metals from England than she had given back. The Under Secretary in his long and able review had taken occasion to say that, on the whole, he thought there was much reason for hope as to the progress of India. He concurred with the hon. Gentleman. He believed that the present improvement was only a beginning, and that, if an intelligent interest were taken in India, in twenty years to come the India of that time would no more be recognized as the India of to-day than the India of to-day could be recognized as the India of twenty years past. He would conclude by expressing his hope that in future the Government would be able to introduce the Indian Budget at an earlier period of the Session.

MR. PLATT said, that he felt great interest in the question, inasmuch as the prosperity of Lancashire depended, in a great degree, on the development of the resources of India. At one time it was said that Indian cotton would not be used in Lancashire. No doubt before the American War very little of that cotton was used; but since then the exports of cotton from India had risen from 125,000 lbs. to 30,000,000 lbs. per annum. He did not mean to say that some of those exports did not find their way to the Continent, but three-fourths of the Indian cotton was used in Lancashire. The town which he represented (Oldham) used, he believed, one-sixth of the cotton imported into this country, and three-fifths of the cotton it used was Indian cotton. Oldham was the first town to use Indian cotton, and by the use of such cotton it had been able to surmount the crisis caused by the civil war in America better than any other town in Lancashire. He did not go so far as to call on the Government to grow cotton in India, but he asked them to give facilities connected with it. The Government proposed to make railways on a large scale, and he would suggest that a preference should be given to railways that went through the cotton districts. The manufacturers of Lancashire had been pertinaciously pressing on the Government the question of roads to the cotton districts for many years past. Some ten years ago he was chairman of a cotton company in India, which came to grief in consequence of the want of roads. Lord Halifax, who was at that time Secretary of State for India, gave a promise that a railroad to Darwar and the cotton districts should be immediately commenced. Now, after a lapse of nine years, there was a prospect of the road being commenced, and he trusted that it would be made. India could produce more cotton without diminishing the quantity of land devoted to the production of the food of the people. The produce of cotton was only from 50 lb. to 70 lb. an acre. They did not ask for an increase in the acreage, but for an increase in the productiveness of the land which was now employed. He found that in the Southern States of America, by the employment of artificial manures and other means, the produce of the soil had been raised from 500 lb. to 700 lb. per acre, and if the same thing could be done in India there was a large margin for the further development of the cotton trade. He agreed with the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) that a Board of Agriculture, or else a Minister of Agriculture ought to be appointed in India, with agents and inspectors in all the subordinate districts. If this were done, it would turn out immensely to the advantage not of the revenues of India only, but also of its ryot population. There was no country in which information upon agricultural matters was so much needed as in India. This was well proved at the time of the war with Russia, from which country we had been accustomed to obtain our supplies of jute. It was soon discovered that the article could be grown in India, and from that time jute became a permanent export of India. Neither did he think India had any reason to fear the competition of America in the production of cotton. Much was said just now about the Chinese settling in the Southern States, but he believed that a great social battle would have to be fought before that could be accomplished. Lancashire could consume any amount of cotton from India. Indian cotton, when well selected, was quite equal to the middling cotton of America. There was another remark of the hon. Member for Manchester with respect to the advantages of America in manufacture which he could not endorse. It must be remembered that since the Americans had adopted a high tariff they had lost every neutral market in the world—even the market of China. This was so much the case that Mr. Wells, who had been sent over to this country to inquire into our system of Free Trade had recommended, on his return, a great relaxation of the American tariff. He hoped it would not be considered that Lancashire was importunate in pressing the Government as it did.

Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN said, he must complain of the great expenditure on barracks in India. The greater portion of that expenditure was worse than useless. He doubted whether, even by skilful organizations, we could reduce our Army of 64,000 European soldiers in India — soldiers who were very costly to us, and of whose value the highest opinions had been expressed by Runjeet Singh and Shere Ali. No class deserved more care and sympathy than those troops. Each man of them was really worth his weight in rupees; and, in spite of all the care that could be taken as to their clothing and lodging, their health and strength would gradually ebb away. But while the officers could go to the hills or get leave of absence to recruit their health, there was no such resource for the men, who gradually died off or were sent home invalided. He would urge that European soldiers might occupy healthy hill stations to a much larger extent than they had hitherto done. There were spots, such as Darjeeling, on the slopes of the Himalayas, the Neilgherries, and even the Western Ghauts, where the men could be kept in health and spirits as buoyant as at any station we possessed; but in these districts there were only a few detachments, while at Lucknow, Secunderabad, and Nawar, there were small armies stationed. It could scarcely be said in these days of railways and telegraphs that it was necessary to keep large bodies of European troops in close proximity to Gwalior and Hyderabad in order to overawe the natives of the semi-independent states, when far more healthy quarters could be found for them in the neighbouring hills. At Morar very large and extensive barracks had been built, sufficient for a brigade of European cavalry, besides infantry, though the spot was noted for its unhealthiness; and the 71st Highlanders, when quartered there, buried 10 per cent of their numbers in a few months. It would be presumptuous in him to say whether, instead of stationing our troops in unhealthy barracks, it would be possible to form military cantonments, where in time of peace our soldiers might be employed in industrial and agricultural pursuits. He ventured merely to direct attention to this point, which involved not merely the welfare of many thousands of our fellow-countrymen, but even the safety of our Indian Empire.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, that the people of India might suppose, judging from the tone of the present debate, that in the House of Commons India was looked upon either as a Manchester colony or as a military settlement. He protested against the postponement of all discussion on Indian subjects to the very end of the Session, when in one day the House was asked not only to discuss the Budget, but to pass two important measures relating to the future government of India. He certainly should do all he could to defeat these two measures. The late Government had promised a full inquiry into Indian affairs, and he could see no reason why the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), and his hon. Friend the Under Secretary for India, should seek to pledge the House without redeeming that promise, as no Committee on the affairs of India had sat for the last ten years, though the whole state of affairs in that country had changed more than man could conceive. He considered, therefore, that the House was being treated in the most supercilious way by the present Government. Was India, he asked, to be governed for her own welfare, or for the sake of Manchester? No doubt cotton was a good thing, and hon. Gentlemen of one idea might think that India was made for the purpose of supplying it, and of receiving Manchester goods. But he did not so deem it. He felt some sympathy for the 184,000,000 of natives of India, and his hon. Friend the Under Secretary, before he was in Office, had felt some sympathy for them too. He hoped that he should not be disappointed in his expectations from his hon. Friend. When he heard of his appointment he was rejoiced by it, because he thought that he did sympathize with the natives. There were two or three special points to which he would now call the attention of the House. One was the salt tax, which the Government of India ought to consider very seriously with a view to its modification. Salt was a necessary of life; the absence of it led to disease; and, in the interests of humanity, the tax should not be continued in its present form. If a poor ryot attempted to scrape a morsel of salt out of the mud of which his cottage was built, he subjected himself thereby to the severest penalties. Then there was the revenue derived from opium. It certainly was a most unhappy thing that the Government should so long have indirectly been encouraging a contraband trade with China. No doubt there was a lawful use of opium; but there was also a demoralizing use of it, and he could not withhold blame from the Indian Government in past years for having abetted the latter in order to fill the coffers of the Indian Treasury. He did hope that the Government would alter its course of procedure on this head, and, without throwing the trade open, separate itself from the responsibility of the trade itself. He appealed to his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bright) on this point. One of these days the opium trade might again lead us into war, and he hoped that his right hon. Friend, if he were still the man he once was, would unite with him in saying there should be an end to revenue derived from this demoralizing source. The third point he wished to allude to was the system of public works—and here he must express his regret that so very little encouragement was given to private enterprize, thereby limiting the introduction of English capital into India. He could not but think that the wiser course would have been to encourage its introduction as widely as possible; for, surely, there was scope enough in India both for the Government and for the English capitalist. He had given a Notice on the subject for next Session. The matter ought to be thoroughly gone into by a Committee next year, and then justice might be done to India on this point.

Mr. BRIGHT said, he would put it to the Committee whether, after the discussion of that evening, as well as on a previous occasion, it would not be desirable that his hon. Friend the Secretary for India should be allowed to proceed with the Bills relating to that country which were set down on the Notice Paper. Unless there were great objections to those measures, it would, it seemed to him, be a great pity at the end of the Session, when the changes which were proposed with respect to administration in India could not be much affected by anything which might be said in that House, that the Bills should not be allowed to pass. The speech of his hon. Friend who had just sat down was one of a very lively character, and he could assure him that so far as many of the points on which he had touched were concerned, he sympathized with him now as well as in past times, when he took a much more active part in the discussion of Indian affairs. It was not possible, however, on the present occasion to alter the duty on salt or to do anything with regard to the opium question, while it would be a great convenience to the Government and the House that the Bills relating to India should be proceeded with at once. If that were not done, the probability was that they would have to be abandoned for the Session, and the majority of the House would, he thought, be sorry that such should be the case.

Mr. DICKINSON said, he intended to enter into the general question raised by the financial statement of the Under Secretary for India, but at that late hour would refrain from doing so.

Mr. GRANT DUFF begged to add his entreaty to that of his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade, that the Bills in question should be permitted to be advanced a stage that evening. With the view of facilitating that course he trusted he would be pardoned if he did not reply to the speeches which had been made during the evening, as well as on a previous occasion, in the usual way.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 150.]

[*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, it was certainly understood by those Members who listened to the speech of the late Secretary for India (Sir Stafford Northcote) last Session that the whole question of the Government of India, which it was admitted required to be calmly considered and thoroughly discussed by Parliament, should be referred to a Select Committee of the House at the commencement of the present Session. The actual words used by the right hon. Gentleman were, as reported—

> "I think that the best plan would be, when the Bills are introduced next year, that they should be referred to a Select Committee, and under these circumstances I beg to move that the Order of the day for going into Committee upon the Bill should be read and discharged."

At the time when these words were spoken they were heartily responded to; and it was in the hope that the present Secretary of State for India would assent to the wise and judicious course of action proposed for adoption by his predecessor in Office that he had refrained from renewing the Notice he had placed upon the Paper in the last Parliament for the appointment of a Select Committee on Irrigation. And if, in July of last year, it was acknowledged that the appointment of a Committee upon this subject was desirable, he thought it could not be denied that the necessity for such an inquiry was greatly increased at the present moment, when one of the largest questions which could possibly arise, vitally affecting the interests both of this country and of India—namely, whether the construction of railways and of works of irrigation still so urgently required should be monopolized by the Government or thrown open to private enterprize—was now pressing hard for decision, and was reported to have been all but finally decided upon by the Council of India without that House having been consulted at all. Surely a question of such vast importance in its results to both countries, and so closely mixed up with the constitution of the Council of India, that one could not separate the two, ought not to be decided either one way or the other by any other tribunal than Parliament itself, to whom alone the solution of such a national problem could be satisfactorily intrusted. Up to the present moment no public discussion worthy of the name had been had on these momentous questions, and the minds of English statesmen had not been brought to bear upon them in a clear and distinct manner, and he was sure that not only would that House, but that portion of the public most interested in the matter, agree with him in saying that until a full, patient, and thoroughly sifting inquiry had been made by some such means as a Select Committee, no satisfactory result could be hoped for, or discussion had. That House had, in fact, no materials before it by which it could properly and with satisfaction to itself discuss and decide on a matter fraught with such immense results for good or evil to the Governments and people of both countries; and he therefore earnestly put it to the Under Secretary of State for India whether it was right to proceed at the fag-end of a Session with measures as to the merits of which that House was in almost total darkness, and whether it would not be an act of wisdom, which would be appreciated by all who took an interest in

India, on the part of the Government to refer the two Bills now before the House to a Select Committee, and to agree that to the same Committee should be also referred the inquiry as to the best mode of constructing railways and other public works. His hon. Friend near him (Sir Charles Wingfield) had given notice of a Motion similar to his own, and he could assure the Government that the concession he asked for on their part would be received with the highest satisfaction out-of-doors, and be accepted as a convincing proof that they had the real interests of India at heart, and were not desirous of preventing a full discussion founded upon the best information that could be procured. He begged to move that both the Bill under discussion and the Governor General of India Bill be referred to a Select Committee next Session, and he should take the sense of the House on the question.

Sir CHARLES WINGFIELD said, the Motion of which he had given notice referred only to the Governor General of India Bill. He could see no reason why the Bill now under consideration should not be proceeded with.

Mr. C. DENISON said, he had formerly entertained the same opinion as the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Kinnaird) that these Bills ought not to pass the House at so late a period of the Session, without their being referred to a Select Committee; but when those who were specially interested in the subject took counsel together they came to the conclusion that the first Bill might be allowed to pass upon condition that the objectionable clauses in the second Bill should be withdrawn for the present Session. He, therefore, could not divide with his hon. Friend.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, that the Bill involved a principle of the utmost importance, and would make a fundamental alteration in the constitution of the Council of our vast Indian Empire, and the term for which the members of that Council were elected. It had, indeed, undergone partial discussion last year; but since then a clause had been introduced under which every member of the Council must be appointed by the Secretary of State for India. The House and the country were very much in the dark as to the manner in which the new Government of India had worked during the last ten years, and he was therefore of opinion that the subject ought to be thoroughly inquired into. In conclusion, he entered his protest against the hurried way in which it was proposed to discuss this important question.

Mr. AYRTON said, his hon. Friend (Mr. Kinnaird) was altogether wrong in supposing that he desired last Session to have these Bills referred to a Select Committee. On the contrary, he was extremely anxious that they should be discussed publicly in the House.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Vacancies to be filled up by Secretary of State).

Mr. R. N. FOWLER entered his protest against proceeding with a measure of this vast importance at so late an hour (12 40 A.M.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Members of the Council of India to be in future appointed for a term of ten years).

Mr. DICKINSON said, he entertained great objections to the system now so common of buying out by pensions officials who had become too old for their work. When competent men were constantly coming home from India they ought not to retain worn-out men in the Council. The hon. Gentleman moved in page 1, line 18, after "years" to leave out "and," and insert—

> "Determinable on his attaining sixty-five years of age; and every member of Council who has not served ten years before the passing of this Act shall continue in his office for a period of ten years from his appointment, and no such member of Council, whether appointed or continued, shall."

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he would support the Amendment. He protested altogether against that Indian Council. They ought to have a responsible Government. The Secretary of State for India and the Under Secretary, with a proper staff, ought to suffice without a Council of old individuals, whose age, according to the Returns, was marvellous. Some members of the Council were in India thirty years ago, since which period the greatest changes had occurred there, so that their knowledge of the country was quite antiquated. The House ought to be careful not to waste the money of the people of India in salaries and pensions for such a body.

SIR CHARLES WINGFIELD said, he hoped the House would not accede to the Amendment fixing the limit of age at sixty-five years. Judges and other public servants performed their duties satisfactorily at the age of seventy and upwards, and he did not see why it should be enacted that no man should sit in the Council of India after he was sixty-five years of age.

MR. GRANT DUFF begged the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Dickinson) carefully to remember that they were now dealing with councillors, and not with administrators. For the purposes of a Council men rather gained than lost by advancing years, provided they retained their faculties—and certainly many persons of active mind retained their faculties in perfect vigour when considerably over the age of sixty-five. That House was one of the very last Assemblies in the world in which they ought to speak of sixty-five as an age at which men ought to retire from active public life. A leading case was that of Lord Palmerston, and there were many others who showed great power after the age of sixty-five.

MR. KINNAIRD said, if he remembered rightly the intention was that there should be fresh blood in the Council of India. They did not want old gentlemen who lived in India twenty years ago, but men who were well acquainted with what was passing in India now. He regretted to see this retrograde policy of the Government.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, the course of Her Majesty's Government in fixing one arbitrary line ought to be regarded as sufficient. He should object to a double check. The matter might be fairly left to those who were responsible, for they would not be likely to appoint unfit persons.

MR. DICKINSON said, he had no desire to press the Amendment as to age. His object was not to give annuities to those to whom they were not bound to give them.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 18, after the word "and," to insert the words "every member of Council who has not served ten years before the passing of this Act shall continue in his office for a period of ten years from his appointment, and no such member of Council, whether appointed or continued, shall."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 11; Noes 70: Majority 59.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he would beg to move the omission of the words "except as herein-after provided," with a view to other Amendments removing that provision from the Bill which gave the Secretary of State the power of re-appointing members of the Council at the end of their term of service. He did not think members of the Council should be put into a position which obliged them to look to the Secretary of State for re-appointment.

SIR CHARLES WINGFIELD said, he would support the proposed Amendment. Some men might be tempted to ingratiate themselves with the Secretary of State in the hope of re-appointment. The first quality a Council should possess was independence; if the Secretary of State had councillors whose first object was to please him, the result would be to increase his power amazingly, while it diminished his responsibility. Earl Russell and the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) had strongly insisted upon the independence of the Council at the time it was formed.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said, he should support the clause as it stood. At the time the Council was appointed the idea was to curb the power of the Secretary of State. That feeling had passed away, and it was now recognized on all hands that the Council should be a consultative and not a controlling body. Neither of the hon. Members who had preceded him seemed to understand the full meaning of the provision they wished to amend. The Secretary of State could not appoint without good reason, and his reasons would have to be drawn up and laid before Parliament.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, it was a mistake to suppose that there would be a rivalry among the members of the Council to flatter the Secretary of State, for they could not be sure that any particular Secretary for India would remain long enough in Office to reward them for obsequiousness.

MR. COLLINS said, he thought it would be a very unwise thing for the Committee to declare that a man who had served in the Council for ten years, and had there earned distinction, should not be allowed to serve other five, should the Secretary of State believe he was capable of doing further good service.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 3 and 4 *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (As to retiring pensions of existing members of Council).

Mr. GRANT DUFF *moved* that the following words be added:—

"And it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by warrant under her sign manual, countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to grant to any member so resigning, out of the revenues of India, if he shall have been elected or appointed before the passing of this Act, and if he shall have held the said office for the period of ten years and upwards at the date of such resignation, a retiring pension during life of five hundred pounds."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. DICKINSON proposed the following proviso:—

"Provided, That when and so often as a vacancy shall occur during the continuance of any pension under this section, the Secretary of State shall, by reducing temporarily the number or salary of newly-appointed Members of Council, arrange that the total charge for salaries of Members of Council and pensions under this section shall not exceed eighteen thousand pounds a year."

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 6 (Appointment of ordinary members of the Governor General's Council and of the Presidencies).

Sir CHARLES WINGFIELD said, he objected to the clause, which would place the appointment of the members of the Governor General's Council in the hands of the Governor General. The object should be to give the Governor General honest, independent advice.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, he thought it very undesirable that his Council should be any check on the Governor General. It should be rather a Cabinet to assist him.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Mr. Collins

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA BILL.

[Bill 89]—(*Lords*)—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committtee read.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, that this measure stood in a very different position from that which had just passed through Committee. That was of comparatively small importance, while the present Bill was the reverse. He felt, therefore, that it would be wrong to go on with it at the present period of the Session. There were, however, three clauses respecting which, he believed, no difference of opinion existed, and which were of considerable importance—namely Clauses 1 and 2, which corrected a clerical error in a former Act, and Clause 9, which enabled the Government of India and the Legislative Council to pass a Vagrant Act for India. These clauses he would ask the House to pass.

Sir CHARLES WINGFIELD said, he approved of the clauses in question.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Clauses 3 to 8 *struck out.*

Clause 9 amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause 10 *struck out.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments, and an amended Title; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

HABITUAL CRIMINALS BILL—[Bill 73.]

[*Lords*]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON *moved,* after Clause 17, to insert the following clause:—

(Criminal after tenth conviction to be treated as an habitual criminal.)

"Provided always, That any person who shall have been convicted of repeated misdemeanours, may, after the tenth conviction, be deemed guilty of an aggravated misdemeanour, and such person shall be liable to the same punishment as if he were convicted of a felony, and shall be treated as an habitual criminal."

Mr. BRUCE said, the clause certainly deserved consideration, but he would oppose its insertion in the present Bill. As worded it would render any person who had been ten times convicted of drunkenness liable to be treated as an "habitual criminal."

Clause *negatived.*

Sir GEORGE JENKINSON then proposed another clause, imposing additional punishment for aggravated assaults on the police.

Mr. BRUCE said, he thought that cases of this kind were sufficiently provided for under the existing law.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock, and to be *printed.* [Bill 264.]

PHARMACY ACT (1868) AMENDMENT BILL.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Several *agreed to;* and one *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. Secretary BRUCE, The LORD ADVOCATE, Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, Mr. AYRTON, Mr. ADAM, and Dr. BREWER:—To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

Reason for disagreeing to one of the Lords' Amendments *reported,* and *agreed to.*

To be communicated to the Lords.

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 6th August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading—* Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans)* (280).

Second Reading — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* (272); Dividends on Public Stocks* (269); Harbour of Galle Loan* (266); East India Loan* (267); Inclosure of Lands* (270); Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* (273); Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* (271); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment* (227).

*Committee—*Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* (266).

*Committee—Report—*Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham)* (263); Expiring Laws Continuance* (262); Accounts, &c. Presentation* (253).

*Report—*Seeds Adulteration* (276); Nitro Glycerine* (277); Railways Abandonment* (249).

*Third Reading—*Telegraphs* (243); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment* (256); Public Works (Ireland)* (255); Clerks of Assize* (248); Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul)* (246); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (251); Basses Lights, Ceylon,* (254); Criminal Lunatics* (247); Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland)* (249); Militia Pay*; Militia (Ireland)* (252); Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment* (257); Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment* (232), and *passed.*

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 6th August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee—*Parochial Schools (Scotland) [215]—R.P.; Charity Commissioners* [239]—R.P.

*Committee—Report—*Straits Settlements* [259]; Contagious Diseases* [255]; Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c.* [256]; Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation* [254]; Parochial Schools (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [215]; Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan [253]; Charity Commissioners* [239].

*Considered as amended—Third Reading—*Government of India Act Amendment* [150]; Governor General of India* [89]; Habitual Criminals* [73]; Millbank Prison* [258]; Bishops Resignation* [241], and *passed.*

Third Reading — Prevention of Gaming (Scotland)* [248]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland)* [261], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

ARMY—HENRY-MARTINI RIFLE.

QUESTION.

Mr. MUNTZ said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If it is intended to proceed with the manufacture of the Henry-Martini rifle otherwise than for trial; and, if he is aware that very grave doubts are entertained by competent parties as to the durability of the mechanism of the presumed improvement?

Captain VIVIAN, in reply, said, it was not intended to proceed with the manufacture of the Henry-Martini rifles till they had been tested in the hands of the troops; therefore 200 rifles would be distributed among small portions of the troops quartered in various parts of the world, so that the efficiency of the weapon might be tested in all ways and circumstances. As to the second part of the hon. Gentleman's Question, the authorities were not aware of any doubts as to the permanency of the weapon, and those whose duty it was to test it saw no reason to entertain such doubts.

LORD ELCHO said, he wished to ask if any test were to be used for the cartridge as well as for the rifle?

CAPTAIN VIVIAN said, that it was intended to apply further tests to the efficiency of the cartridge, so as to obtain the best possible cartridge for the rifle.

DAGENHAM DOCK COMPANY.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he could state the grounds upon which the Customs' License to land and store goods at Dagenham has been refused to the Dagenham (Thames) Dock Company, three Acts of Parliament having passed for the construction of these works, and the sum of £170,000 having been expended on the faith of these Acts; whether the late Commissioners of the Treasury did not decide to grant the Company's application, and why that decision has been reversed by the present Board of Treasury; and why the correspondence between the Company and the Commissioners of the Treasury and the Board of Trade respectively, ordered by the House to be printed on the 10th of June 1869, has been produced in an incomplete state, and why those omissions in the Correspondence have not hitherto been supplied?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the reasons why the Customs' License to land and store goods at Dagenham was refused were—1st, the remoteness of the locality, it being ten miles by railroad and more by water from the Custom House; 2dly, the want of adequate accommodation there for the trade; 3dly, the increased expense of sending officers to exercise supervision in such a place; 4thly, the risk to the revenue likely to arise on account of the lonely and retired nature of the place; 5thly, the necessity which would infallibly arise from a precedent established in this case of offering to other places the same advantage, and the absence of any additional accommodation to that offered by the existing dock companies. The right hon. Gentleman here read the following extract from the Customs' Report for this year relative to the contemplated dock:—

> "The frontage of the platform to the river is very limited, too much so to be fairly called a wharf. It is uncovered and completely exposed to the weather, affording no shelter for men or goods. On the line of the railway, not far from its junction with the Tilbury line, are two large sheds erected, as I was informed, about two years ago. On the left of the railway as it approaches the jetty, and in the midst of the land belonging to the Dagenham Dock Company, is a long piece of water known as Dagenham Lake. It is this lake which it is proposed to convert into a dock, but no works for that purpose have been commenced. On the river side of the barrier bank—which separates the river from the lake—some excavation has some time ago been made to form an entrance basin, but the action of the river has now nearly filled it up, and no further progress has been made on the bank of the river in the construction of wall, wharf, or entrance."

In respect to one part of the Question of the noble Lord, he must state that the late Government never positively acceded to the application of the company, but they made a Minute, and the matter was then referred to the Customs' Department for further inquiry, with a suggestion that the traders themselves should be left to judge whether or not the trade was likely to justify the grant of the concession of the privilege. From that view the present Treasury Board emphatically dissented, not thinking it right that the trade should decide whether the expense of sending Custom House Officers to places like that in question should be incurred. With regard to the last part of the Question, he was not aware of anything being incomplete in the Correspondence, but if the noble Lord would point out any omission it should be remedied.

MR. AYRTON said, that the Papers he had already laid on the table, contained the whole of the Correspondence with the exception of one letter.

RAILWAY SIGNALLING.—QUESTION.

MAJOR WALKER said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he has been able to lay upon the Table of the House the replies, he promised, from the different Railway Companies to his Circular; and if not, whether he will lay them upon the Table of the House before the end of the Session?

MR. BRIGHT: Sir, the replies to the Circular which has been sent out by the Board of Trade are not all received, and are consequently at present imperfect. In the case of one of the most important railways, the London and North-Western Company, the Board of

Trade has, with the consent of the company, directed an inquiry into a modification of the block system which they have proposed, and which, if it be approved of, they propose also to extend. Under these circumstances, as the Report will be so incorrect and incomplete if presented at the present time, it is thought better to delay laying the answers on the table of the House until the opening of next Session.

ASSIZE SENTENCES ON CRIMINALS.

QUESTION.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Sir George Jenkinson), he would beg to ask the Question which stood in the name of the hon. Baronet on the Notice Paper—namely, Whether the attention of the Secretary of State for the Home Department has been called to the great inequality of sentences frequently passed at Assizes on various criminals; for instance, the five following cases are reported in "The Times" of the 5th instant, under the head of "Assize Intelligence":—Case 1. Home Circuit, Crown Court, August 4, by Mr. Justice Mellor, a man named Simmons, convicted for feloniously killing his wife at Redhill. Details very revolting and brutal; guilty, but recommended to mercy; not concurred in by the Judge; sentence, five years' penal servitude. Case 2. Same Court, a man named Fyfield, convicted for feloniously cutting and wounding his wife with intent to murder her; details very bad; guilty; a bad case of unlawfully wounding; sentence, eighteen months' imprisonment. Case 3. Same Court, a man named Gore, for feloniously inflicting grievous bodily injury with intent to do so; he beat a man severely with his fists; sentence, fifteen years' penal servitude. Case 4. Midland Circuit, York, August 2nd, Crown Court, Mr. Justice Brett, three men, named John Brown, Henry Lock, and William Johnson, breaking into a bacon-house and stealing eight hams and two shoulders of bacon; sentence on Brown, seven years', and on Lock and Johnson, five years' penal servitude. Case 5. Western Circuit, Bodmin, August 2nd, Mr. Justice Keating, a man named William Rapson Oates, a "herbalist," obtaining £2 5*s*. by false pretences; guilty, recommended to mercy; sentence, five years' penal servitude. And, whether Her Majesty's Government contemplates taking any legislative steps to obtain greater uniformity in the sentences passed on criminals in the various Assize Courts? He thought it right to add that he had been unable to verify the cases cited by his hon. Friend.

MR. BRUCE said, that he, like the hon. Gentleman, had also been unable to verify the cases cited by the hon. Baronet; but he had no doubt that at the recent Assizes, as at previous Assizes, inequalities might be observed in the sentences. They might be accounted for partly by the fact that all the circumstances which dictated to the Judges the decisions to which they came were not reported, and partly by the different constitutions of the minds of the Judges. With regard to the substantial part of the Question—whether the Government intended to take any legislative steps to obtain greater uniformity in the sentences passed upon criminals? he was not prepared to answer the Question affirmatively.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 215] (*Lords.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 24 (Act not to affect certain bequests).

LORD ELCHO moved that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

MR. DISRAELI: I cannot allow this Motion to pass in silence. I think it the duty of every Member of this House at this period of the Session to give every possible support to the Government—consistently of course with their individual opinions—to wind up the business, and carry those measures which are thought, on the whole, necessary for the public good. But I must say that I am surprised at the position in which much of the Public Business is now placed—especially with reference to this particular measure of the Scotch Parochial Schools, which has had a very injurious effect upon the conduct of other Public Business. This is really a matter of importance, because I need not remind the Committee that it has been brought under the consideration of the House by a notice in Her Majesty's gracious Speech from the Throne; and no measure is ever noticed by a Minister in the Speech from the Throne unless it is decided by the Cabinet to be one of importance, and unless it is matured with the utmost study and judgment on the part of the Government. Under these circumstances, it seems to me much to be regretted that we should be called upon to discuss a Bill of considerable complication, on a subject of such importance, and introduced in the Speech from the Throne, at a moment when the Appropriation Bill is on the Table. And I cannot think that we ought to pass over without notice a combination of circumstances so unfortunate. Is it the fault of this House? Is it the fault of those who have felt it their duty to give some opposition to this measure? I cannot find that there is any fault to be fairly imputed to this House for this unfortunate state of affairs, or that it can for one moment be alleged that it arises from any vexatious opposition on on the part of Gentlemen on this side of the House. Some time ago this Bill came from the House of Lords with considerable Amendments, some of those Amendments being moved by one of Her Majesty's Ministers. On that occasion the Lord Advocate took a course which I observed with regret. It is possible it might be technically defensible; but I appeal to the candour of the Committee whether, when a Gentleman moves that we should go into a Committee *pro formâ* on a Bill in order that it may be re-printed, anyone could suppose that it was the object of the learned Lord to make the enormous changes which he on that occasion so successfully accomplished.

The LORD ADVOCATE: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I stated the changes I proposed, and gave the reasons for moving to go into Committee on the Bill *pro formâ*.

Mr. DISRAELI: That may be so; but is it not a fact that no Gentleman in the House was aware of what was going on? ["No."] Well, I hope for the credit of the House that it is so, because I cannot conceive that a proposition of that kind could be made; and I should have thought that the hon. Gentlemen opposite me would have thought it decorous, by way of precedent, that notice should have been given by Government of the changes they intended to propose.

The LORD ADVOCATE: I must again rise to explain that I made a statement of considerable length, giving not only the changes we meant to introduce, but the reasons for so doing. I think the right hon. Gentleman, before he makes charges of this kind, should inform himself as to the facts.

Mr. DISRAELI: It is quite unnecessary for the learned Lord to interrupt me, because I was not going to insist upon the circumstance. It was disapproved by the House and regretted, but it was condoned; and consequently I declined to notice it — and the best defence for it is this—that it was a matter of exigency. The Government believed that this was a measure of primary importance, and that the course they took was the only way in which they could put their complete and matured views before the House and the Committee. And although I regretted that the practice should pass unnoticed, still I thought there was some defence and vindication for the course that had been pursued. But having placed their views before the House, have the Government adhered to them? Having struck out all these Amendments, and having deprived the House of the opportunity of considering the Amendments made in "another place," have the Government adhered to the views which they adopted, and their adherence to which could only have justified this summary proceeding? Nothing of the kind. To say that the conduct of the Government has been inconsistent would be an inadequate phrase. It has been incoherent. It has been not only capricious and vacillating, but diametrically opposed on most important points from night to night. I say, Sir, that this is not a proper way — at least, it is not a desirable way at any time of settling questions of importance; but if the Government change their opinions on matters of importance in the middle of a Session, there is an opportunity of discussing and considering their propositions, and of coming to a mature decision upon them. But it is highly undesirable that such a course should be taken by the Government at the fag-end of the Session. We have five prints of this Bill in our possession, and in many of their provisions they are diametrically opposed. We are now asked, with the Appropriation Bill on the table, to proceed with this legislation.

Now, Sir, I will not enter into any of the details of the clauses which have been so changed, and some of which are opposed to each other. The Scotch Members have a particular process of conducting their legislation through this House. They are satisfied with it; and, I think very unwisely on the part of this House, that system has not been challenged. I think it is not a desirable system, because one of the practical results is that the Scotch business is settled in a hole-and-corner, and the Scotch Members degrade themselves to the position of a select vestry. There is thus necessarily a deficiency of knowledge and sympathy with the Scotch Members which is not at all desirable. I know the influence of Scotch Members, and that if they are resolved upon a particular way of conducting their business, it will be impossible for us to resist it. But what I maintain is this—that anything connected with Scotch education is not merely a Scotch question, but one of national interest, and one on which the House ought to be fully acquainted with the proposals of the Government, and the motives which influence them. I heard during the course of these proceedings that when a difficulty arose, a compromise had been arrived at between the Government and the opponents of the Bill. You cannot carry on the affairs of the world without compromise, and I was not sorry to hear that the difficulty had been overcome. I know that Gentlemen who had opposed the Bill ceased to oppose it, and some even ceased to attend the House any longer. I was afterwards surprised when the Government informed us they did not intend to adhere to that compromise, but had made another arrangement contrary to it — an arrangement which was not made in the House, or in consequence of any debate in this House. That is a course of affairs to be deprecated. We must remember the circumstances under which the question was first brought before us. It was noticed by the Government in the Queen's Speech. It engaged the attention of their predecessors. It was a subject of magnitude—a question, in fact, of improved national education for Scotland. Well, Sir, we cannot legislate on a subject of that kind without sanctioning some principles and agreeing to some conditions which hereafter may be appealed to in vindication of a measure of English national education. It is a subject of general and universal interest, and one to which we ought to give our attention, in a manner becoming the question, and without the haste and precipitation which distinguish the present course of proceeding. I know it is said—and indeed it is the only argument in favour of the present course which I have heard—that if we do not pass a measure of this kind, a considerable proportion of the population of Scotland will be deprived of the advantages of education—some 90,000 children, as we were told the other night; but do you mean to say that because 90,000 children may be deprived of the advantages of education you are to pass an improper Bill at an improper time? There are more children proportionately in England who are deprived of these advantages than in Scotland, but no one will pretend that we ought to discuss and pass a Bill for national education in England when the Appropriation Bill is on the table. Now, Sir, I wish to assure the House and the Government that in making these observations I am only speaking what I think is for the interest of the country and of the House, and that I am merely maintaining those views which I have always supported. I will not quote anything that I have myself said, but I will refer to the course recommended by the present Prime Minister in 1856, and in which I supported him. What I am about to read is not a long paragraph, but it is characterized by all that ability and happiness of expression which might be expected from such a quarter. In his unfortunate absence it is a very great advantage that we should be guided by his experience and judgment. The right hon. Gentleman was alluding to the state of Public Business at the end of 1856, and he was also referring to the Bishops of London and Durham Retirement Bill. He said—

> "Now, Sir, as regards this measure, I do not hesitate to say that, quite independently of its particular provisions, I think we ought not, under any circumstances, to be called upon to pass such a measure at such a time. It is impossible at this period of the Session to give to a subject of this grave importance and of this extreme difficulty the consideration which it requires. Why, Sir, it is even impossible at this time fairly to collect the sense of the House upon such a question. It is only a fortnight ago since this House virtually rejected the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill. Within that fortnight the business of the country

has been almost entirely wound up. We have passed the Appropriation Bill—that which we look upon as the natural termination of the important business of the Session; our functions in Committee of Supply have ended. It is not merely the date of the 23rd of July which we have to consider, though I must say that if Government continue the practice of introducing these most difficult Bills, these measures of such vast importance, when the Session is expiring, it will be necessary for this House, in self-defence, to resort to a measure which has been adopted in the other House, and to pass rules fixing positive dates after which they will not consent to entertain such measures. I am quite sure that the noble Lord at the head of the Government must feel that in expressing these opinions I am expressing the opinions generally entertained by the Members of this House. We have, in fact, come to a state of things in which some forty or forty-five persons holding Office under the Government virtually decide every question before the House. It is hardly possible that any combination of Members, or the union of any body of persons, whatever their position or views may be, can face so formidable an official phalanx."—[3 *Hansard*, cxliii. 1327.]

The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright) has asked me for the book, and he will no doubt give us his version of the situation, although I believe he did not speak on that occasion. What I press upon the Committee is that the view which the Leader of the House took in 1856 was a sound and temperate one, and I do not understand why the Government should persist in pressing on this Bill when the Appropriation Bill is on the table, when the Committee of Supply is closed, and when there is no possibility that, either in this House or in "another place," there can be any of that matured discussion by which a right decision can alone be arrived at upon national education—a subject on which, of all subjects in the world, a right decision is surely the most desirable.

The LORD ADVOCATE: Unquestionably I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that this matter of Scotch education is a matter of interest, not only to that "select vestry" of Scotch Members which he has been kind enough to allude to, but to the House of Commons generally; and I am sure I only express the views and feelings of the Scotch Members when I say that it is with pleasure we see so distinguished a Member of this House taking an interest in the question, and that we should have been very glad if that interest had been developed a little earlier in the Session. It seems to me that if he had taken that course, he would not have fallen into the multiplicity of mistakes which has characterized the speech he has just made; and I cannot but regret that the right hon. Gentleman's interference in this interesting matter should have been confined to taking up a portion of that short time during which we might have made progress with this Bill. In regard to the history of the Bill, it is needless for me to go back upon it in detail, although the right hon. Gentleman has not heard it. Those hon. Members who have taken an interest in and attended to this matter as to a public duty are familiar with the facts. The Bill was introduced as the fruit of the Report of the Royal Commission, and it was introduced in "another place" early in the Session. That there were conflicting views upon the subject of the Bill we are perfectly well aware. Even before the Bill was introduced into the House of Lords the Commissioners had recommended a compromise. The House of Lords threw over the compromise, at least in one important particular, which is not without analogy or importance in the present discussion. The question in dispute related to the management of the parochial schools and the new schools. The compromise recommended by the Commissioners was to leave the parochial schools under the old management, and to place the new schools under the new Board about to be constituted. The Lords threw over the new management, and adhered to the management of the old parochial schools; and in a great many particulars the Bill was altered in their Lordships' House. When it came down here, the question was how to deal with the Amendments of the Lords, and I endeavoured at once to show to the House and to the country the real propositions of the Government, and the principles upon which they wished to take the opinion of this House. I know that, even as matters stand, in Scotland the real proposition of the Government has hardly yet been understood, not from want of information, but because the print with the Lords' Amendments sent down to Scotland has been up to this time believed in many quarters to be the Bill of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman has accused me of an offence which he says has been condoned. I was not aware that I had committed any offence, or that I stood in need of any pardon. I was at a loss to know how to deal with the Bill as it came from the Lords, and I consulted the best authorities I had access to. I allude to the clerks who sit at this table, and whose advice is generally resorted to; and I was advised, and I believe soundly advised, that there was nothing improper or out of Order—nothing but what was perfectly regular—in committing the Bill *pro formâ* for the purpose of introducing Amendments. I made a statement on the second reading which the right hon. Gentleman did not do me the honour to attend and listen to, and I then stated fully what the Government intended to take and what they intended to reject, and I terminated my speech purposely by saying that the Government would go into Committee *pro formâ*, for the purpose of re-printing the Bill with the Amendments the Government proposed. The House were at no loss to understand my statement, and it is unreasonable that I should now be told that I have followed a most unprecedented and improper course. So much for the history of the Bill. Now, it is said that this was a compromise. But there was no compromise in that sense of the word. The real matter is this—It has been a debated question from first to last whether parochial schools should be left under their present exclusive management, or whether the management should be rendered more liberal. That question was discussed in "another place;" and the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire (Mr. Orr Ewing) has had on the Paper in regard to this Bill a Resolution for the purpose of altering the constitution of the parochial schools ever since the Bill first came down here, but in the speech I made I unquestionably stated that, on the whole, the Government thought it better to adhere to the compromises suggested by the Commissioners. But that was a matter entirely open to debate; and, if the Government had been defeated on that point, it would have been quite open to accept the Amendments of the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire. We divided on the question whether the parish schools should remain as they were or not. We resolved to accept the Amendment, and I think my hon. Friends the Members of the "select vestry," who sat upon that side of the House, entirely concurred with me also. They thought it was rather late to call upon them to consider the matter. I am perfectly certain they do not sympathize with the Motion made by my noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho); and now what are we told? We are told that it is outrageous to go into Committee on a large Bill at this time of the Session. Sir, this is not the first time the House has done such a thing. I remember we sat one Session up to the 28th August—the year in which the Divorce Bill was introduced. I say there is no more urgent subject than a subject of this nature, and I trust the right hon. Gentleman, having relieved his own mind by the expression of his opinion, will neither create nor encourage any delay.

MR. HENLEY said, that anyone who had been unfortunate enough to have been in this House during the last ten days as many hours as he had could not fail to have been struck with two remarkable things. One was that they were now setting an extraordinary precedent for future legislation in the way in which measures had been got through during the last few days. He thought they were going a pretty good pace to bring legislation into contempt, and if legislation was brought into contempt, he did not know that contempt of law would not follow. The other point was this—he gave no opinion as to the changes which were about to take place in the measure which had stopped the way for so many days, but there were 200 Amendments to the Bill, and they were told this morning that the Lord Advocate had assented to seventy of them. That was a pretty good sweep, and he supposed it would make a pretty considerable alteration in the Bill, so that when the measure went back to "another place" it was very likely to give rise to considerable discussion. He gave no opinion on the matter. He did not understand whether the change was right or wrong; but he had a very strong opinion that if the Government thought it right to make such extensive changes, those changes ought to have been made ten days ago, when all the time which had been wasted in fruitless discussion would have been saved, and then it would have been possible for the alterations to have received that amount of consideration when they went back to "another place" which they were entitled to. These were points which had struck him very forcibly. He confessed he should be very sorry to see the course which had been pursued with regard to this Bill set up as a precedent for the future mode of doing business in that House. He thought it inconvenient, and as he said before, he believed it would tend to bring legislation into contempt; and he could not conceive any inconvenience in a measure or two standing over for another year, which would be greater than the giving rise to a belief that at the end of a Session a mass of legislation was got through without receiving the consideration which it deserved, and without giving time to the "other place" to which all Bills must go, for dealing properly with them, instead of shuffling them over in the way in which a good many Bills had been shuffled over during the last few days.

Mr. COLLINS said, he must protest against the course which had been adopted with regard to this Bill. This House had never seen the Bill as it left the Lords at all, for it was committed *pro formâ*, and when it came on for discussion it was virtually a new Bill. The whole explanation made upon it on going in Committee *pro formâ* did not last three minutes, and it consisted of a *sotto voce* conversation between the Speaker and the Lord Advocate, and—he did not know whether the reporters had "struck" at that period or not—not a line of it appeared in the newspapers. The going into Committee on that occasion took place between two and three o'clock in the morning, and the people of Scotland, unable to obtain any information of it through the daily journals must have been in a state of complete mystification about it. He objected to the Bill going forward now, lest it might be made into a precedent for England. The Bill sought to alter the whole taxation of Scotland, and the whole mode of regulating the schools; and they did not even know yet whether the clause for denominational schools might not be struck out by the Liberal Members for Scotland. He trusted the Bill would not be allowed to proceed further this Session.

Mr. CANDLISH said, it seemed to him that if hon. Members had only discussed the Bill instead of wasting time over preliminary questions, the measure would have left the House long since; but the policy of the Opposition had been to discuss over and over again whether they should proceed with it or not. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks objected to proceed with the Bill on the ground that at such a time of the year it would be supported by the votes of thirty or forty Members of the Government. But a night or two ago, in a House of something like 150 Members, upwards of 100 voted in favour of proceeding with it. The question was, was Scotland in favour of the measure? Well, interpreting the will of Scotland by the representatives of Scotland in that House, he thought it clear that it was the desire of the people of Scotland that the Bill should pass. The present Session had not been a long one compared with some recent Sessions. In 1867, the House sat until the 23rd of August, and long before the 23rd of August this year this Bill could be fairly considered by both Houses of Parliament.

Major WALKER remarked that a large number of Scotch Members were absent from the House at the present period, and he presumed that it might, therefore, be concluded that they were not very anxious on the score of this Bill. He was supplied by the Lord Advocate with a good argument for voting in favour of the Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair, for the right hon. and learned Lord had made the admission that the Bill was not understood by the people of Scotland. He trusted that the Government would see fit to withdraw the measure.

Mr. BRIGHT: Sir, I could conceive circumstances in which the objection which has been made by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) should be held to be valid; that is, if the question was one of great difficulty, and if its principle was contested. But judging from what has taken place on this side of the House, and from what we have seen on several occasions on the other side, there is really no considerable difference of opinion in regard to the Bill itself. If we were a month earlier in the Session, nearly all the arguments which are now used against the Bill could not be used, and the Bill would stand generally supported by the great majority of Members on both sides of the House. I have heard it said from this Bench that hon. Members opposite have opposed the Bill as if they did not believe that it was a bad Bill, or as if they believed that a Bill of this kind should not be opposed. If we are agreed on that, what reason is there that a Bill of this kind should not be passed now? If you believed that the Bill was bad and embraced principles which, if carried out in Scotland, might be held to be wrong for the rest of the Kingdom, then you might vote against the Bill and decide to reject it. But the fact is quite contrary; and no one can doubt the importance of the Bill itself and the question it is intended to settle. Everyone knows that we have had during the whole Session a succession of deputations from Scotland to represent to the Government the importance of this question. I believe there is no Member of the Government—no Member of the Cabinet, certainly—who has not had interviews with several deputations from Scotland in connection with this Bill; and we have had them constantly in the Lobby. It shows that there is a very great interest in the question, and the object of the Government has been to meet, as far as it was possible in one Bill, the general views of the people of Scotland in regard to this question. Now, the right hon. Gentleman says the Lord Advocate has not adhered to the general principles of this Bill. But he is the last man that should say that, for he, of all Ministers that I have ever seen, was the most pliant in regard to the great measure of which he had the conduct some time ago. And it was only because he was pliant, and because he acted on the theory—which he has promulgated to-day, not for the first time, that compromise was necessary, that he was enabled to pass one of the most important measures that is now on the statute-book of this country. The Government, doing the best they could under the circumstances, have conducted the plan and brought the Bill to its present position. And now, if it was left to the Scotch Members on this side of the House, you might count on the fingers of one hand the number of Scotch Members who would oppose this Scotch Bill. It would be carried all but unanimously by the Scotch Members—and more than that, it would be carried unanimously by the English Members on this side of the House—and if hon. Members opposite would only act on their opinions, they also would pass the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) says we are bringing legislation into contempt. The fact is, that this House is so numerous, that unless three-fourths of the Members went away at the end of the Session we should not pass any measures—because there are so many Members, all representing earnest constituents, and there is so much to be debated, that it is only when the House is thin that measures of this nature and the general run of legislation can pass through. What has taken place this Session is what has happened in previous Sessions. I know it depends very much on the character of the Administration what measures shall pass at this period of the Session; but my own opinion is that this is one of the Bills in passing which at this period of the Session the country will say the Government has done its duty. Look at the difficulty of passing any Bill at all. See what difficulties there have been this Session. See what difficulties there will be next Session, with a number of important Bills, as we hope, coming forward; and would it not be beneficial that the House should clear away, for a time at least, the great question of Scotch education? The right hon. Gentlemen has referred to the 90,000 children in Scotland, and he says there are many more in England. That may be true. But surely if we delay this Bill now, and it is to come on again next Session, it will block the way of the measure which is to meet the wants and difficulties of the people of this country. I appeal then, to hon. Members to let this Bill pass. The Government is not interested in the Bill any more than other Members. Our object is to make the legislation of this Session as advantageous as possible, and I believe if this Bill were to pass it would make this Session much more valuable. The House of Lords understands this question thoroughly. They will not require to discuss it from beginning to end. There are Lords enough now to discuss it; and there can be no doubt that, seeing they have had it under consideration before, they will not object to the Bill going up now. We have done the best we could during one of the heaviest Sessions the House of Commons ever had, and I do appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite not to give it a vexatious and party opposition. [LORD ELCHO: Not party.] Well, I will withdraw "party," and will say opposition against a measure which is supported by this side of the House, and which receives all but the unanimous support of the people of Scotland; and I believe, if they look at what the interests of the country require, they will allow the Bill to proceed and the clauses to be got through, which may be done within the next hour or hour and a-half.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would acquit him of having shown any hostility to the Bill. There was a great deal of good in it, but, at the same time, the course which had been followed by Government, though technically correct, was not the usual one. The right hon. Gentleman committed the Bill *pro formâ*, and then re-printed it. But surely it would have been better for him to have placed on the Paper the alterations which he proposed to make. Three or four weeks after the Bill was re-printed, the right hon. Gentleman, in consequence of the remonstrances from all sides of the House, as to the difficulty of understanding the position in which the Bill was, had his Amendments re-printed separately. He ought to have taken that course in the first instance. The result was that the people of Scotland had had no opportunity of seeing the Amendments on the Bill, and did not know in what position it now stood. As to the attempt that had been made to cast the blame of delay on his side of the House, to that he demurred entirely. The opposition to the Bill proceeded from the Government side of the House below the Gangway, and to cast the blame on this side was most unjust. He had listened attentively to this discussion, but he had failed to see that any hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House had taken up the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, who quoted the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown as to the procedure on the part of the Government in attempting to pass a Bill of this importance after the Appropriation Bill had been laid on the table, and no hon. Member had attempted to reply. If this Bill had been pushed with vigour, he believed it might have been passed through the House; but it could not be expected that they would allow a measure of this importance, affecting the whole of Scotland, to pass in this hurried manner.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that the President of the Board of Trade had admitted that if this Bill introduced any principle with respect to education for Scotland which would be objected to for England he should regard the opposition to this measure as entirely justifiable. Now, he (Mr. Lowther) would take his stand on the 59th clause, which authorized school committees to impose assessments upon lands and heritages to maintain new national schools. Now, he (Mr. Lowther) most decidedly and entirely objected to an educational rate for England, and therefore he strongly objected to such a precedent being established in a Bill brought into that House at the very end of the Session. The Prime Minister had pledged the Government not to propose or agree to any increase of local burdens until the entire question of local taxation had been brought before the House, and this was a question of local taxation. Many of the Members for Scotland were favourable to a compulsory rate, which was a first step towards compulsory education. Now, in England, with few exceptions, there was a strong repugnance to compulsory education on the part of the great mass of the people. As the Bill introduced a precedent for Scotland which many hon. Members would oppose for England, a case had been made out, on the right hon. Gentleman's own showing, why the House ought not to pass the Bill this Session.

Lord ELCHO was sorry to interfere between the Committee and the division, but having moved that the Chairman leave the Chair, he thought it right to explain his reasons. As the learned Lord Advocate well knew, no one had worked more heartily with him in the cause of education than he had done fourteen years ago. The Bill which his hon. and learned Friend attempted to pass in 1854 was a far better measure, much sounder in principle, more liberal and comprehensive, and founded upon a better system than the Bill before the House. The Bill of 1855 was a national measure. It embraced the old parochial schools, and established new schools for all Presbyterians. By the compromise which was made the other night, and which was a compromise between what the supporters of the Government wished and what the Government itself was pledged to, the parochial schools were taken entirely out of the Bill, and new schools were to be maintained out of the rates, practically for those who were not members of the Established Church, but belonged to the Presbyterian faith. They were to remain untouched, except that the management was liberalized to a certain extent. In addition to that, a provision was made, which he admitted was perfectly reasonable, for the education of Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, whose faith and feelings would not allow them to attend the parochial or district schools. He should be most inclined to take his stand on the question of the incidence of taxation proposed in this Bill. Let property be rated to the full amount necessary for the purposes of education, but let the taxation be just. Let it fall on all who were interested in education—and he maintained that the whole population were interested in the question — and not merely those who were the owners of heritable property. Personal property ought to be rated as much as heritable and landed property for this purpose. This Bill did not do that. It extended the area of taxation, but it left the burden where it originally stood—on the owners of real property. He believed that one of the causes of the anxiety of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to get the measure passed was to get in the thin end of the wedge, and get Parliament to sanction by legislation the principle of rating real property and not personal property for the purpose of education. English Members had better look to this. He (Lord Elcho) had never taken a factious course in that House, and he had only moved to report Progress because he held that there was a large principle at stake in this matter, much more important than even the Education Bill itself. That question was the mode of conducting Public Business in this House. As a Scotch Member, he protested against the mode of conducting Scotch business adopted in this case—namely, that measures of the utmost importance should be chopped and changed about to suit the feelings and views of the thick-and-thin supporters of the Government; and he objected altogether to Scotch measures—measures of vital importance—being brought forward at a period of the Session when they had only a few hours to discuss them. He had simply done what he deemed to be his duty in the Motion he had made, for he did not think it right that measures of this kind, about which they were told the Scotch people knew nothing, should be hurried through the House as was now proposed. He entered his protest against such a course, and should press his Motion to a division.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair." —(*Lord Elcho.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 27; Noes 99: Majority 72.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 25 *struck out.*

Clauses 26 to 33, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 34 (Ratepayers or town council refusing to elect school committee).

On the Motion of Mr. M'LAREN, clause amended by inserting a provision respecting the election of the school committee by the town councils.

LORD ELCHO said, that the word "secretary" occurred in line 30, and he wished to remind the Committee that the question arose the other day as to whether the secretary should or should not be a clergyman. Through a misunderstanding on his part, he was then unable to press that question, and the clause which enabled them to put it passed without their being able to elicit a definite answer on the subject. To speak plain upon this matter, he had to state that a rumour was in circulation that a certain rev. gentleman who had been extremely useful to the Government at the last election had a promise of this secretaryship. Considering that the Board was to be undenominational in its character, and that they were about to establish an undenominational system of education for Scotland, he did not think a greater mistake could be made than to appoint to the office of secretary the representative of any sect in Scotland. He hoped therefore that when his right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate came to give a definite answer as to the constitution of the Board, he would be able to give an equally definite answer in regard to the question whether or not the secretary was to be a clergyman.

MR. M'LAREN said, this question had been more than once before the

House, and he must enter his protest against the attempt to put in one man by knocking down the reputation and ability of another man. Such a rule laid down in that House would be an implied censure on every clergyman in Scotland; and he altogether objected to the principle of saying that 3,000 or 4,000 ministers should all be held to be disqualified from filling an office of this kind. He held that an office of this kind would be exceedingly well filled by a person who had received the special training of a clergyman. As to the particular minister, he was not aware that he had interfered in any election whatever. He maintained that the Government ought to find the best man they could for the office, irrespective of where he was or what he was.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said, he agreed with the sentiments expressed by the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire. He (Mr. Dalrymple) spoke in the interest of no man; but he distinctly said that it would be a most unfortunate circumstance if any but a layman should be appointed to this office.

Mr. GRAHAM said, he could not hear any allusion made implying a stigma on the ministers of Scotland, and remain silent. This was a revival of the cry made the other day casually, and afterwards disowned by the gentleman who made it, that all the ministers were, in fact, firebrands. He trusted the Government would not consent to give any pledge whereby ministers of religion would be shut out from appointments in connection with education.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 35 to 43, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 44 (Examiners to hold the office for two years, but may be re-appointed).

Mr. HENLEY said, that this and the subsequent clause opened up a question which was not confined to Scotland, although it referred to the superior kind of education which was intended to be conferred upon the people of Scotland. It opened up an examination to the nobleman's son if he chose to avail himself of it, as well as to the child of the humblest person. When they came to a later clause he should ask some Member of the Government to explain the estimated cost which the public might be called upon in two or three years to provide, and to tell the Committee what would be the relative cost of these examinations of masters by University Professors, as compared with the examination by the Inspectors of the Privy Council. The further question then arose whether the Government would undertake to hold out the same liberal hand to the people of England and Ireland which the Bill held out to the people of Scotland. Would the same liberal scale of education paid for at the same rate be secured to the rest of the Kingdom? It would not be right that a very costly system of examination should be established in one part of the country, without a full understanding that the Government, assisted by the Scotch Members, would provide an equally liberal scale of education for the whole of the United Kingdom. It would, he imagined, require a grant of something like £200,000 a year to carry out this system of examination in London alone. He gave great credit to his Scotch friends for their shrewdness in these matters, remembering as he did that they had obtained for themselves, at the public expense, an ordnance map of six or seven inches to the square mile, which we had never yet been able to obtain in England. Before the Bill went out of Committee, some Cabinet Minister would, he hoped, give a public assurance that an equal measure of liberality should be dealt out to England and Ireland, when measures of national education were framed for those countries.

Mr. M'LAREN objected to the proposed establishment of four independent Boards of examiners, one for each University of Scotland. He apprehended that the effect of this competition would be to reduce the standard of qualification until it became almost nominal. He regretted that the Bill departed from the system of examination by the Inspectors of the Privy Council, which was almost perfect and cost nothing; whereas the system now proposed was unsatisfactory, and would cost a great deal.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply to the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire, said, it was the duty of his Department to ascertain whether the mode of examination by University Professors would impose a larger charge than that conducted by Inspectors from the Privy Council. There was reason to believe that it would not. The present inspecting staff of the Education Office was fully worked, and as under the Bill there would be at least 400 more persons to be examined every year, an increase in the number of Inspectors would be required fully equal to the cost of the University examiners. When the right hon. Gentleman asked that the same measure of liberality should be extended to England and Ireland that would be carried out by this Bill for Scotland, he must remind him that the present conditions of education in the former countries were different from those established by this Bill for Scotland. In Ireland three-fourths at least of the education expenditure were paid out of the Consolidated Fund. In England a larger proportion was raised by voluntary contribution, but there was no educational rate, such as was proposed to be levied in Scotland under this Bill. Where people rated themselves for an object they usually expected to have their share out of the taxes, and to have a voice in the management. No precedent, therefore, could be drawn from Scotland by England and Ireland under the different conditions of their present educational system.

MR. HENLEY wished to know whether the Committee were to understand that the right hon. Gentleman, on the part of the Government, stated that in no case should an education rate be adopted in England? He did not grudge the people of Scotland their educational advantages, but he protested against the inference of the right hon. Gentleman that because there was some difference between the education systems of England and Scotland, the people of England were not to have equal help.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had not made any statement or conveyed any impression in regard to the intentions of the Government upon the English Bill, as to whether it would or would not include an education rate. It was equally beyond his power and his province to give any assurance upon the matter one way or the other, or to give any idea as to what the intentions of the Government might be when they came to consider the subject.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he intended to ask for some information as to the financial working of this Bill. He feared that the right hon. Gentleman's calculations were altogether unsound, and that the effect of this examination would be to make a larger demand upon the public purse than the right hon. Gentleman anticipated. The examination by Inspectors of mixed teachers was much superior to that by Professors, especially in the case of women teachers.

DR. LYON PLAYFAIR reminded the Committee that the training of the teachers in Scotland had hitherto been at the Universities—the training and normal schools being new to them—and expressed his belief that nothing could be more unpopular in Scotland than the taking away of the power which it was proposed to give by this Bill with respect to the examination of the teachers by University Examiners. The whole training of teachers in Scotland had been carried on in the Universities, training schools and normal schools being very modern contrivances; and nothing would be more unpopular in Scotland than to take away the power intended to be given by the Bill. He approved of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Edinburgh.

THE LORD ADVOCATE suggested that the hon. Member for Edinburgh should bring up his question on the Report, when there would be in the hands of the Government fuller information in regard to the expense.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 45 and 46 *agreed to.*

Clause 47 *postponed.*

Clause 48 *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day.*

TRANSIT OF VENUS (1874).

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. CHILDERS said, that in the year 1874 the transit of Venus would give the opportunity of carrying out one of the most remarkable investigations that could be made in connection with astronomy. The only method of ascertaining the distance between the sun and the earth, or, more correctly speaking, the horizontal parallax, was to observe the transit of Venus over the sun's disc, which would occur in 1874, for the first time after the transit observed by Captain Cook during the last century. The Admiralty had taken pains to ascertain the expense of observing this transit of Venus wherever it might be visible in various parts of the world, and they had come to the conclusion that it would be desirable to ask for a sum of £10,500, and to spread it over the next five years. The object of this Resolution was that the Admiralty might begin at once to take the necessary steps, and as this was a matter of prospective expenditure, the Government thought it desirable to obtain the leave of the House before undertaking outlay which would be spread over a considerable time. The amount was small, while the object was of great scientific value. He moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the carrying out of the arrangements necessary for observing the Transit of Venus which will take place in the year 1874; and to assure Her Majesty that this House will make good any expense that may be incurred thereby.

In answer to Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH,

MR. CHILDERS said, that £2,200 would be spent next year, and the remainder of the sum of £10,500 would be spread over the rest of the five years.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the carrying out of the arrangements necessary for observing the Transit of Venus which will take place in the year 1874; and to assure Her Majesty that this House will make good any expense that may be incurred thereby.

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

MARRIAGE LAWS.

OBSERVATIONS.—QUESTION.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER: Sir, I rise to call the attention of the House to the Report of the Marriage Law Commissioners, and to inquire whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, in the next Session of Parliament, to introduce a Bill for the purpose of establishing a Marriage Law as nearly as possible uniform for all parts of the United Kingdom, upon principles of equality as between all Churches and religious denominations. At an earlier period I have been unwilling to press on Her Majesty's Government the question of the marriage laws of the United Kingdom, because I was well aware that the business they had in hand was of so great magnitude as to make it unreasonable to expect that they should undertake another subject of great magnitude and importance in the present Session. But when I remember that among the subjects intimately connected with the Irish Church question now settled was this one, which was distinctly promised to be made the subject of legislation in the very next Session of Parliament—the relation borne by the Church now disestablished to the marriage law of that part of the United Kingdom—the effect of what has been done being to produce, as soon as that Act comes into operation, an absolute dead-lock with regard to the marriage law affecting a very large class of Her Majesty's subjects in that part of the United Kingdom, and not only affecting those belonging to the Church of England in Ireland, but also in a great measure the marriage law affecting all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in that part of the United Kingdom who were expected by law to take advantage of the arrangement made, with reference more especially to the position of the Established Church, it is impossible, in these circumstances, that legislation on the subject of the marriage laws can be deferred to a later period than the very next Session of Parliament, and I am most anxious in that state of things to take advantage of the opportunity so offered to impress on the Government the importance of at once dealing with the entire question, and now making a uniform and consistent marriage law on principles of religious equality for every part of the United Kingdom. The House will permit me to remind them both of the circumstances under which the Commission of 1865 was appointed on the subject and the nature of the Report made by the Commission. There had been several Bills introduced in order to mitigate the inequalities and inconveniences of the extraordinary state of law as to marriage now prevailing in Ireland. There had also been brought very prominently before the attention of the public a succession of cases of a very singular description from Scotland, illustrating what are there called irregular marriages. One of these cases — the Yelverton case—attained very great notoriety, in which, first of all, a lady took advantage of an action by a tradesman against her alleged husband, to raise the question of her being married in Ireland. She had been married there by a Roman Catholic priest, but the husband was a Protestant. She persuaded an Irish jury that she was married. The question was afterwards raised in Scotland. There was a great difference of opinion on the Bench, and it was ultimately decided by the House of Lords that she was not married. That and other remarkable trials called attention to the singular law prevailing in Scotland, and to the great scandal of there being in this highly civilized United Kingdom such a great mass and variety of marriage laws which no Government had yet attempted to reduce to consistent and uniform principles. Under these circumstances a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the laws in force in different parts of the United Kingdom with respect to the constitution and proof of the contract of marriage and registration and other means of preserving evidence thereof, and also into the state and operation of the laws of the United Kingdom in relation to the marriages of European British subjects in India and the colonies—a much less important, but not unimportant subject. The Commission was composed of many persons of very considerable eminence in the law, and of representatives well selected, I think, from all parts of the United Kingdom. Its Report received the entire concurrence of three Noblemen, who now, or formerly filled the Office of Lord Chancellor—Lord Chelmsford, Lord Cairns, and Lord Hatherley; and the mention of those three names as entirely and without qualification concurring in the Report must go along way to recommend to the favourable consideration of the House the propositions which have their united sanction. Besides these eminent men there were on the Commission the Judge of the Divorce Court, Lord Penzance, who entirely concurred in their recommendation; the Queen's Advocate, Sir Travers Twiss, who, with some trifling modifications, concurred in the Report; Mr. Walpole, the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge; Lord Lyveden; Mr. Monsell, the Under Secretary for the Colonies, and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland—both able and worthy representatives of of the Roman Catholic portion of the community. From Scotland, entirely concurring in the recommendation of the Report, were the Solicitor General for Scotland (Mr. G. Young), and Mr. Murray Dunlop, formerly M.P. for Greenock, and who, I believe, I am not wrong in saying is connected with the Free Church. These gentlemen—entirely and without qualification, except in the case of one of their number, an immaterial qualification on a small point of detail, the rest without any qualification—concurred in the Report to which I shall now invite the attention of the House. There was one other Commissioner—the head of the Court of Session, Lord President Inglis—who did not concur in the recommendations affecting Scotland. With that exception we have the Scotch Commissioners representing the feeling of the Presbyterians; the Irish Commissioners representing the Roman Catholics; and the English Commissioners representing the legal science, as well as, to a great degree, the general intelligence of the country. The state of the law which the Commission had to examine and report upon exhibits probably as extraordinary a condition of the law as it is possible to imagine in a country so highly civilized as ours. I will take, in the first place, the marriage law of England, which, perhaps, of the three presents the smallest amount of anomaly. The law of England draws a very sharp line at the outset between members of the Established Church and all the other members of the community. As regards members of the Established Church, in its desire to guard against clandestine marriages the law recognizes two modes of doing so. One, the process of marriage by banns, appears by the evidence to be perfectly useless in the only cases in which, at first sight, it would appear to be of importance. Persons who are desirous of evading the law go to populous places where they are not known, and where the long bead-roll of names is called over in such a way as not only to constitute in itself a somewhat indecorous interruption of Divine service, but to defeat altogether the object of publicity. I really believe that if any hon. Member of this House had a member of his family desirous of being married without his knowledge the most effectual method of accomplishing this would be by having the banns published either in London or in Manchester in the very church attended by the other members of the family. The names would probably not be heard at all, or, if heard, would not be recognized; and, accordingly, the publication of banns has been found to be a useless formality. In some small rural parishes, it is true, the publication of banns may be useful, but then the same object would be accomplished by the mere personal knowledge of the clergyman. As to the license a very small sum—a sum small to us, at least, though, perhaps, not small to everybody—will procure what is practically a dispensation from all precautions whatever. A person may get the license and be married the same day. The inquiries made are purely formal, and if everything that is said in answer is absolutely false it will make no difference whatever in the ultimate results. In the Established Church marriages no civil registrar is required to be present, or to have any notice given to him. On the other hand with regard to all bodies of Nonconformists the presence of a civil registrar is required, and notice has to be given in his office. In many respects the particulars required are well conceived; but the difficulty is to explain why, whatever is good for one class as far as notice is concerned is not equally good for the other. The House, generally speaking, would probably be disposed to agree that if we could provide a uniform law applicable on the same principle to all it would be a great improvement. The Jews and the Quakers have also separate laws for themselves; I do not know that any great inconveniences arises from this, but it is possible that there may be questions of a theological character which would invalidate marriages. In all those forms of English marriages the law may be invalidated by a non-compliance with any of the requirements of the law, although these, in themselves, for the most part do not seem so important as that a marriage once solemnized should be voided on the mere ground of error or accident. For instance, if the place where the marriage is celebrated is not properly consecrated or set apart, or if the marriage is effected in some other locality than where the banns have been called, or if any other error affecting time or place is made by the parties, that entirely invalidates the marriage, although, upon other grounds, there may be no objection whatever to it. These are criticisms which, in Scotland, are thought to be solid and sound against the English marriage law. The Commissioners thought them well deserving of attention; and while it would be a great thing to get a uniform system for all parts of the United Kingdom, they considered that this was to be gained by applying principles of amendment to every part of the United Kingdom, and not by endeavouring to force the law of England upon Scotland or Ireland, or the law of either of these countries upon England. Then I come to Ireland, where the state of the law is very much worse. To reduce it to a minimum, there are at least five different methods of marriage. First of all, in the Established Church, or what was lately the Established Church, there is no material difference from the system prevailing in England, though there are some differences of detail — with which I will not trouble the House — which seem to exist only for the purpose of increasing the anomalies. Then we come to the Roman Catholics. As to them, there is absolutely no marriage law at all; it is left under the old canon law — and nothing but the presence of a priest is necessary in order to make a complete and good marriage between Roman Catholics in Ireland. But if a Roman Catholic priest should presume to celebrate a marriage between a Roman Catholic and Protestant, or even between a Roman Catholic and a person who had been a Protestant within a year of the marriage, till comparatively a recent time, that was a capital offence; and, even now, it is a criminal offence of a very high order, and the marriage is absolutely void. That has not been so in England. A Roman Catholic priest, in a place duly registered, might solemnize a marriage, even between two Protestants; and so might a Dissenting minister. But in Ireland, the marriage law is denominational to a most extraordinary degree. There is one law for the Episcopalian Anglicans; another

—and the loosest of all, except that of Scotland—for the Roman Catholics; a third law for the Presbyterians, who have a special system of their own, rather like that of the lately Established Church, but not the same; and for all the other bodies a fourth system. Lastly, there is the system of civil registry. I do not fatigue the House by going into all the diversities of forms and ceremonies, differing in each case; it is enough to say that there has been a most ingenious system of inventing differences and distinctions, where the object ought to have been to get rid of them—these differences and distinctions turning almost entirely on sectarian and denominational grounds. Then, in Scotland, we have a state of things entirely different from both the other countries. Till 1834, this state of things existed; there were several laws in force, and there were also irregular marriages, subjecting the parties to fine. I do not know whether they were subject to imprisonment also; at all events, they were subject to punishment at the hands of the civil magistrate, but the marriages themselves were recognized as valid. The regular marriages were those in which banns were asked, and marriages celebrated by a minister of religion; but the regular marriages were only permitted to be celebrated by ministers of the Established Church. The consequence was that a very considerable proportion of the marriages in Scotland were solemnized irregularly, and parties used to go before the magistrates and get themselves convicted of the crime of an irregular marriage, and so procure—if not a marriage license in another form—at all events, some legal recognition of the fact. In 1834, Lord Russell, then in this House, introduced a measure to do away with these religious distinctions, enabling ministers of other religious denominations to solemnize marriages in all respects as lawful as those of the Established Church. He left—I do not know whether by accident or not—one single remnant of the old system—namely, a requirement that the banns should be in all cases called in the Established Church; and a very odd operation that regulation is attended with. Strictly speaking, the banns should be called on three successive Sundays, so that a long time ought to elapse before the marriage can be effected; but, practically, on the payment of a fee, the session clerk will call over the three sets of banns altogether. That is a remnant of the old system, and I suppose the small fee has operated very mildly, for it has not been got rid of; but the effect of the change has been that irregular marriages have disappeared very largely from the general social system of the country. Irregular marriages still occur here and there; but all the witnesses from Scotland say that the enormously preponderating proportion of marriages in Scotland are solemnized in the presence of a minister of religion, and therefore the wants and habits of the people no longer oppose themselves, as they formerly did, to such an assimilation of the law of the countries as would get rid of irregular marriages altogether. I may mention that a material step towards that end was taken by Lord Brougham, fourteen or fifteen years ago, when he introduced an Act to abolish Gretna Green marriages—a system of irregular marriages, of which advantage was taken by people in England, for the most part living just over the Border. But that Act abolished these marriages by requiring fourteen days' residence in Scotland. No public excitement followed. From that time Gretna Green marriages have ceased, and the time has now become ripe for dealing with the subject of the marriage law of Scotland in a manner consistent with preponderance of opinion not only of those who bring ecclesiastical minds to bear upon the question, but those who look at it from an Imperial point of view, of whom there are many in Scotland as well as elsewhere. The system of irregular marriage in Scotland is a very startling thing to those whose minds are not thoroughly accustomed to it. Those marriages are contracted in two different ways. Suppose any Gentleman in this House visited a house in Scotland where a young lady happened to be staying, and that he and the young lady took a walk together, and in the course of the walk he took a piece of paper out of his pocket on which they wrote down a mutual promise to marry; though the piece of paper might be simply put back again into his pocket, though nothing might be said to anybody about the writing, and though nobody else might be there at the time, if the persons afterwards lived in a certain way together, that would be a valid marriage, although nobody might know of the fact of the marriage for years afterwards. No mere promise will constitute a marriage unless it be in writing, and unless *subsequente copulâ*. A promise so given and so followed constitutes a good marriage, however long it may be kept secret. There is another even more extraordinary mode, in which no writing at all is necessary, and that is where the promise is made not *de futuro* but *de presenti*—where the woman says—"I take you, John, for my husband," and where the man says—"I take you, Mary, for my wife," before witnesses. A promise of that kind being brought up at any future period, even although the people have never lived together, will hold good, and will be sufficient to overturn any perfectly honourable and reputable marriage that either of the parties may have subsequently entered into, and this actually occurred in the celebrated Dalrymple case. I think that, after all, it is only right that we should endeavour to have a just and uniform marriage law, founded upon unsectarian and reasonable principles. Having already overturned a material portion of the marriage law of Ireland, I venture to suggest that the Report of the Commission to which I have referred is entitled to the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government. I do not ask them to pledge themselves to all the recommendations of that Report, some of which, referring to the preliminaries of marriages, and others to the notice to be given, may admit of a difference of opinion, and improvement; but most of them will, I think, be approved by the House generally. I will state the most important of the recommendations which I think may be adopted with advantage. The Commissioners think that our object should be to secure uniformity of the marriage laws, if possible, throughout the United Kingdom; to secure, as far as possible, without throwing needless impediments in the way of marriage, the authentication of the fact of the marriage having occurred, so that a man and woman may know with certainty whether they are married or not, and other people may have the same certainty on the point; and, while taking precautions against hasty and precipitate marriages, to endeavour to secure the greatest freedom in the matter of marriage. How do the Commissioners propose to effect those objects? Of course the Commissioners had to consider whether it was desirable to adopt the Continental system, under which the parties merely enter into a civil contract before civil officers. While admitting the simplicity of that system the Commissioners did not recommend its adoption for two reasons; the first being that it would be impossible to reconcile the public mind of these kingdoms to a purely secular system of marriage; and the second being that they could attain their object by making every religious minister, of whatever denomination, a civil officer, for the purpose of seeing that the requirements of the law are satisfied, and of reporting to the registrar that the marriage has been solemnized. This latter system they have embodied in their recommendations, under which all religious denominations are to be placed upon an equal footing—all ministers of religion of every Church and denomination, and the civil registrars also, being recognized as competent legal official witnesses of marriage in all parts of the United Kingdom; all persons to have the option of being married by either of these classes, while in each case substantially the same notice and preliminaries are to be adopted. Of course, they propose to sweep away all incapacity of persons on account of their religion to be married by a Roman Catholic or any other minister. The Commission was appointed in March, 1865, and they did not make their Report until July, 1868; and therefore it is evident that they have not drawn up these recommendations without having carefully considered the subject. I will not further occupy the time of the House, but will conclude by asking the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, in the next Session of Parliament, to introduce a Bill for the purpose of establishing a Marriage Law as nearly as possible uniform for all parts of the United Kingdom, upon principles of equality as between all Churches and religious denominations?

Mr. MONK said, that both the House and the Government were alike deeply indebted to the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) for calling their attention, by his able, interesting, and exhaustive speech, to this subject, even on an occasion like the present, when it could not be discussed at the length its importance demanded. The Report of the Commissioners had now been in the hands of Members for eight or nine months, and he thought the Session should not be allowed to pass away without the opinion of the Government upon it being elicited. He must join the hon. and learned Member in expressing a hope that during the Recess Her Majesty's Government would feel it incumbent upon them to prepare a measure based upon the recommendations contained in the Report, which was signed by the present Lord Chancellor and by his two immediate predecessors. That Report recommended that the law of marriage in the three Kingdoms should be rendered uniform, and he believed that that proposal would be approved by all sects and religious communities in the country. He rose chiefly for the purpose of adverting to two of the recommendations of the Commissioners, the first of which related to the presence of the civil registrar at the solemnization of marriages in places of worship other than those belonging to the Church of England — a regulation that had occasioned painful feelings among those who were subject to it. He was glad to find that the Commissioners recommended that that cause of irritation should be removed, and he trusted that under any future measure which might be introduced on this subject, ministers of all denominations would be placed on an equal footing, and that they would be allowed to register marriages without the presence of a civil registrar. The other recommendation to which he wished to refer was that which related to the publication of the banns, which, by the Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke, was directed to be made after the Second Lesson, whereas some clergymen, ignoring the statute law as running counter to one of the Rubrics, thought fit to publish them after reading the Nicene Creed, according to the law as it stood before the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Act. Upon this point he wished to remark that the proper time for the publication of the banns should be clearly fixed by law. The only other point to which he desired to call the attention of the Government was with reference to marriage licenses, and he would call attention to the suggestion made by the learned Queen's Advocate General, Sir Travers Twiss, that the license should not be granted by the same spiritual person who was subsequently to celebrate the marriage. By extending the power of granting marriage licenses to every incumbent of a parish—who would be the same person that had to solemnize the marriage—you would take away the greatest check against irregular marriages which the present system of licenses provided; you would abolish the power of entering a caveat, which has been the means of preventing many a clandestine and bigamous marriage, and you would bring back some of the worst evils of the old system of Fleet marriages, which were put a stop to by Lord Hardwicke's Act.

MR. BRUCE: Sir, even at this advanced period of the Session, when exhausted nature finds it difficult to arouse itself to an interest in anything, I must express the pleasure and admiration with which I heard the statement of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) on this tangled subject. I think he has clearly made out that it is a great scandal to have our marriage laws in their present position, while he has also shown that the remedy for the evil is clear and simple, and based on the strictest principles of religious equality. My hon. and learned Friend has shown that by either of two different systems you might bring about the same result. One is the Continental system of having in the first instance a civil marriage in all cases, leaving it to the parties themselves to have a religious ceremony performed afterwards. The other is, that of having recourse in the first place to a religious ceremony, making it incumbent on the minister who performs the ceremony to register the marriage, or, at all events, in some way to furnish legal proof of it. I may say at once that this subject has not been overlooked by Her Majesty's Government. Indeed, it has engaged the especial attention of the Lord Chancellor, who sat on the same Commission with my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Richmond. During the present Session, however, we have not only not been able to bring forward a measure on the subject of the marriage laws, but even to mature our views as to the precise mode of dealing with the question. My hon. and learned Friend said it will be impossible for this or any other Government to avoid bringing forward next Session a measure to meet the change in the law created by the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and he very truly added that, as some legislation was necessary on the subject, there would manifestly be a great advantage in dealing with the question as a whole, and upon principles which would equally apply to the three Kingdoms. In those opinions it is impossible for any reasonable man not to concur; but I cannot absolutely undertake to pledge the Government, already deeply pledged, to the introduction of a general measure in the course of the next Session. In the course of the present Session we have found it necessary to postpone legislation on the three pressing questions of international law, —namely, the law of naturalization, the law of extradition, and the law of foreign enlistment. All these subjects—subjects of great difficulty—are awaiting legislative solution. Then the Government are pledged to bring in an Irish Land Bill and a Bill on the subject of Education, not to mention minor, but still important, subjects. It would, therefore, be impossible for me to give an absolute pledge that this question of the marriage laws will be dealt with in its entirety next Session; but I can honestly assure my hon. and learned Friend that it is the desire of the Government to deal with the question at the earliest possible moment, and deal with it once and for all, and to deal with it on the broad and liberal principles laid down in the Report of the Commissioners. Without binding myself as to details I may say that the measure will be not less broad and comprehensive than the scheme which my hon. and learned Friend, as the organ of the Commission, has recommended in his speech this evening. I hope that under the circumstances of the case my hon. and learned Friend will be satisfied with that assurance.

Mr. HINDE PALMER said, he hoped that when dealing with the marriage laws the Government would consider the subject of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, with the view of arriving at a settlement on that much disputed question.

THE GOLD COINAGE.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. J. B. SMITH said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the Report of the Master of the Mint on our Gold Coinage, and to inquire of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to an International Gold Coinage. It appeared that a very large portion of our gold coinage was now worn and deteriorated in value. There were upwards 31,000,000 of gold pieces in circulation, of which about the value of 25,000,000 were deteriorated, and were no longer legal coin of the value which they were supposed to represent. In fact they had become mere tokens. Under these circumstances, it would be necessary to recoin them, and the question arose — a question which he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer—who was to bear the loss, which would be a very serious one? In this country the Mint made no charge for converting bullion into coin. In every other country a charge was made for coining. Was our Mint to be the only manufactory in the world which sold the manufactured article at the same price as the raw material? In our own possessions in Australia there was a charge of 1 per cent for coining gold. In India there was a charge of 1 per cent for gold and 2 per cent for silver, and in the United States of America there was a charge of 1 per cent for gold. In 1865, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy entered into a Convention to establish international coinage in those dominions, and great convenience had arisen from that Convention. Gentlemen who had visited those countries since 1865 must know that to be the case. When, twenty-five years ago, he went to Italy through France and other countries he had to change his money fourteen times. Recently he went to Italy, and he had only to change it once. These countries had also an international system of weights and measures, which gave them a great advantage in trading with each other. In 1867 the French Government invited a Conference of nations to consider the question of international coinage. About twenty nations attended the Conference, which was held at Paris, and after several days' sitting they resolved on adopting —first, a single standard of gold; second, nine-tenths proportion of fine gold in the coin. Some other nations had since recognized the Convention; Greece, Austria, Rome, and, he believed, Sweden had since coined 10 franc pieces. Our representatives at the Conference had made a Report, which was referred to a Royal Commission which sat last year. That Report was signed by the Master of the Mint and Mr. Wilson. The Royal Commission of last year said we entertain no doubt that a uniform system of coins as well as a uniform system of weights and measures would be productive of great general advantage, and also recommended another general international Conference, and that led him to the next Question he had to ask of the right hon. Gentleman, whether the Government proposed to recommend any measure extending to this country a system of international coinage, as recommended by the International Coinage Convention of December, 1865? The matter was of great importance to the United States as well as to England, being the two largest gold producing countries in the world; although America was saddled with an enormous debt, and had nobly resolved to pay it off, principal and interest, in gold, they would prefer the advantages of an international coinage, notwithstanding the temporary inconvenience that would result to themselves. To England it would be no inconvenience whatever, for it happened that by the mere alteration of the charge of about 1 per cent upon the mintage our coin would then be equivalent to a 25 franc gold piece; and the Master of the Mint had demonstrated in his Report that if we were to return to the old coinage of the time of Edward III., when 100 pence made a noble and ten pence made a franc, we should then be in exact unison with France. What was wanted was a common identical unit of account known to all the world, in the same way as notes representing musical sound could be interpreted by any musician, no matter what his nationality. It was desirable that this country should take the lead in a matter of such great importance as that of international coinage, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give an answer worthy of an enlightened country and the age in which we live.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, it would perhaps be convenient if he interposed before the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied to the Questions put to him, and asked for some further explanation than had been given by the Secretary of the Treasury the other evening respecting the new appointment to the office of distributor of stamps for the county of Ayr, consequent on the resignation of Mr. Oswald. In former times it was the custom to appoint to the office of county distributor of stamps gentlemen of position, at salaries ranging between £1,500 and £3,000 a year, not so much because of their competence for the duties they had to discharge—for their office might be described as a sinecure—but because they were able to find adequate security for the proper discharge of those duties. But as in process of time postal communication became more easy and safe, and the Board of Inland Revenue extended its ramifications throughout the country, it was found unnecessary to fill these offices, and by a Treasury Minute following certain correspondence between the Board of Inland Revenue and the Treasury, it was determined some twelve or fourteen years ago that in future no fresh appointment should be made to them. This Minute had been acted on in the case of many vacancies which had since occurred — in point of fact, the vacancies had not been filled up. Independently of the saving which would result from the discharge of the duties of county distributor direct from Somerset House, the case of the new appointment he referred to demanded an explanation, because he believed it was not in accordance with modern practice to appoint persons not regularly in the Civil Service to offices under the Board of Inland Revenue. In answer to a Question of his noble Friend the Member for Wigtonshire (Lord Garlies), the House heard from the Secretary to the Treasury that the office of stamp distributor for the county of Ayr had become vacant, and that a re-appointment had been made, subject only to some revision in the matter of salary. No doubt Mr. Brown, to whom the post had been given, was a very respectable and proper person for the office, if it were necessary to maintain it; but he was not a civil servant of the Crown, and had no special qualifications beyond that he was resident in Ayrshire. Now he (Mr. Sclater-Booth), when at the Treasury last autumn, made inquiries in anticipation of a vacancy occurring, because of the late distributor having succeeded to a very large estate by the death of his brother, and he came to the conclusion that the circumstances of Ayrshire offered no sufficient reason for deviating from the rule set forth by the Treasury Minute to which he had referred. The office was unquestionably a sinecure office in Ayrshire, because the duties had for many years been discharged by deputy; and the appointment made, being that of a near relation of the gentleman who had resigned, whose resignation had been expected for more than a twelvemonth previously, had caused such a stir in the county as made it most desirable the right hon. Gentleman should give the explanation he was no doubt fully able to give for the course that had been taken in filling up the appointment. He proposed to move for the original Correspondence which occurred between the Board of Inland Revenue and the Treasury upon the subject, ending in the Treasury Minute stating that such appointments should not be filled up; for a Return of the vacancies which had occurred in the office of county distributor of stamps, showing what provision had been made for the discharge of the duties in each case; and for the Correspondence between the Board of Inland Revenue and the Treasury, showing the reasons which induced the appointment of a gentleman unconnected with the Civil Service to do duties which, in other cases, it was found quite easy to discharge by the ordinary machinery at the command of Somerset House without such an officer.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I believe the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth) has stated the practice in these cases quite correctly—that is, that it is now the practice, whenever we get the opportunity, to amalgamate the two offices of distributor of stamps and collector of Excise, and, as we wish to amalgamate the two departments, I think the practice is a proper one. In this particular case Mr. Oswald was distributor of stamps in the town of Ayr, and he resigned the office in January last. There was not in the town of Ayr any collector of Excise to whom the office could be given; the nearest collector was too far off—namely at Greenock, where the same person discharged the duties of collector of Excise and distributor of stamps; and therefore, contrary to the ordinary practice, and, as it seems to me, under the pressure of clear necessity, the office of distributor of stamps was filled up without being given to a collector of Excise, just because there was no collector of Excise within reach. This is a simple explanation of the fact why the particular gentleman referred to was appointed; and whether there was anyone else whom the hon. Member would rather have had selected I really do not know. The Government seem to have taken every precaution in an exceptional case, and have done only that justified by the necessity of the case. They have entered into an agreement with this gentleman that his appointment shall be liable to revision both as to the amount of his salary and the transference of his duties, if necessary, at any time, so that he holds his office without any claim, even if it should be taken from him. The salary was reduced from £1,150 a year to £800 a year, and, besides that, we required him to give security for £5,000, so, as there was no person in the place connected with the Excise to whom the appointment could be given, as far as I can judge, the Government have taken every reasonable precaution. They have in no way fettered themselves, but they have left the matter so that at any future time, if it be thought desirable, the salary of this gentleman can be reduced, or he can be deprived of his appointment and it can be given to another person. With all these safeguards I really do not know what more could be required. There being no necessity that this appointment should be given to a person who was already in the Civil service, and it being impossible in this case to combine the office with that of collector of Excise, it appears to me to be a perfectly defensible and reasonable appointment. I now turn to my hon. Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith), who has introduced to us a very interesting subject, and one which might very well, at a time of less pressure, occupy the attention of the House —namely, the subject of our coinage. The coinage of this country is in a most unsatisfactory state; there is no doubt of that. The waste with which it is carried on is enormous. The possession of a gold and silver coinage I do not look upon myself as a necessity, but rather as a luxury, and as an indulgence to a popular taste—which, by the way, is a very expensive taste—but as it is the taste of the people of the country, I suppose it will continue to be gratified. It is quite necessary that the coinage of this country should correspond with gold and silver; but I am not aware there is any necessity it should actually consist of those metals. Since the year 1850, according to the calculations of Professor Jevons, who has looked deeply into the subject and has brought great ability to bear upon it, and whose conclusions are adopted by the Master of the Mint, Colonel Smith, and other authorities, we have coined 98,000,000 of sovereigns, and of these 98,000,000 about 44,000,000 have disappeared altogether. Either they have been exported from the country and have not returned to it, or they have been melted down. We have thus had the satisfaction of bestowing a great deal of labour and ingenuity and cost in the manufacture of an article of great merit and neatness in our gold coinage, which has formed a sort of quarry out of which other countries make gold coinage for their own use. The reason of this is not far to seek. As my hon. Friend has said, we, almost alone of the nations of the world who make coin, give to the person who brings us gold the same weight of gold in coin, upon which we have bestowed labour, as we receive from him in a rude unwrought state. We give him our coinage at less than its cost; we give back weight for weight a manufactured article in exchange for the raw material out of which that article is made. It necessarily follows that, as we choose to circulate our coinage at less than its value, so, as coin, it commands less than its value, and is worth less than it really ought to be. It is impossible to make all sovereigns of the same weight; at least, if possible, it can only be done by a minuteness of machinery and a carefulness of labour which make it not a paying thing to do; the consequence is that, within certain limits, sovereigns are heavier one than the other. These sovereigns having no value given to them in respect of the manufacture, the material coin is so much bullion, and is treated as such; and persons take out the heaviest sovereigns and melt them down—a process by which they make a halfpenny for each. London was for many years the seat of this manufacture, which was carried on close to the Mint, where the sovereigns were made, so that the two establishments were side by side, one coining money, and the other melting it down. Then the manufacture went to Paris, where it flourished many years; and now it is carried on at Brussels. While this goes on upon the Continent, there is another cause for the sovereign being put into circulation at the price or value of so much bullion. From the fact that the State charges nothing for the labour expended in the manufacture of it, and that it has no more exchangeable value than the bullion out of which it is made, the sovereign is liable to be exported as bullion, and there are great inducements to export it, because it is bullion already assayed and the weight of which is ascertained. All persons know pretty nearly what the weight of the sovereign is, and therefore it is bullion in the most convenient form for export. The consequence is that, whenever the rate of exchange is against us, and there is an export of bullion from this country, it is very convenient, besides exporting bullion in the unmanufactured state, to export it in the manufactured state, in sovereigns, and by that means to cause a violent and sudden contraction of our currency, which would not otherwise occur. Those are some of the evils that arise from our present system, but they are not all the evils. Although we give our currency to the public for nothing, the Government undertaking the business of an unremunerative manufacture, we take not the slightest precaution, when we have issued that currency, that it shall maintain its value. The original weight of the sovereign ought to be about 123·274 grains of gold, and when the sovereign is so worn that it has lost three-fourths of a grain in value —when it has got below 122½ grains in value, it ceases to be a legal tender. The legal life of a sovereign is about eighteen years, it having in that time, from wear and tear, fallen below its original value. We take no trouble to call in this coin, and do nothing to save the public from the accident of taking light coin; and the consequence is that, after all our expense and trouble, 31½ per cent of our sovereigns and 47 per cent of our half-sovereigns are not a legal tender, because they are light weight; and that, for a country which prides itself above all things upon keeping up its gold standard, and upon having a circulation above all doubt and suspicion, is not only a very great and serious evil, but a great reproach and discredit. I must add that it is an evil which will assume a practical form, because, under these circumstances, a re-coinage will be speedily called for. Something must be done to call in this light coin, and it is assumed that somewhere about £400,000 will be required to re-coin the loss in the weight of our coinage. We are going upon the plan at present of giving out a sovereign, which passes from hand to hand until some unfortunate person finds that it is not a legal tender, and is obliged to sell it for what it is worth for bullion. While we are very liberal in respect of giving our labour for nothing, we seem to be very careless and remiss in taking steps to keep up the integrity and standard of our money.

That is as nearly as I can state it the condition of things with regard to the currency of this country. Well, what is the remedy for this grievance? It is perfectly obvious that it is to be remedied by a natural, simple, and ordinary proceeding; in short, that in manufacturing money we should do as other manufacturers do and take pay for our labour. In effect we sell money to those who bring us gold; for an ounce of gold we give in exchange £3 17*s.* 10½*d.*, and that is the exact weight of an ounce of gold. It appears to me that, while as manufacturers we are absurdly liberal in this respect, we should be much more wise to follow the example of all other countries and impose a mintage, brassage, or seignorage, or whatever it might be called, so as to indemnify ourselves for the expense of maintaining our currency. The practice of this country has been the contrary ever since the reign of Charles II. The opinion that it is right there should be a mintage for the coining of money has been held by almost every considerable writer on political economy. And I will cite one or two instances. Sir Dudley North says—

> "The free coinage is a perpetual motion found out, whereby to melt and coin without ceasing, and so to feed goldsmiths and coiners at the public charge."

Adam Smith says—

> "When the tax upon a commodity is so moderate as not to encourage smuggling, the merchant who deals in it, though he advances, does not properly pay the tax, as he gets it back in the price of the commodity. The tax is finally paid by the last purchaser or consumer. But money is a commodity with regard to which every man is a merchant. Nobody buys it but in order to sell it again, and with regard to it there is in ordinary cases no last purchaser or consumer. When the tax upon coinage, therefore, is so moderate as not to encourage false coining, though everybody advances the tax, nobody finally pays it, because everybody gets it back in the advanced value of the coin."

Therefore, according to Adam Smith, we actually throw away this money we pay for coinage, because it is quite possible for us to get it back at nobody's expense. Another passage to the same effect from Adam Smith is as follows:—

> "The Government, when it defrays the expense of coinage, not only incurs some small expense, but loses some small revenue, which it might get by a proper duty; and neither the Bank nor any other private persons are in the smallest degree benefited by this useless piece of public generosity."

That is the highest authority, and his arguments are of force sufficient to convince anyone that the course we are taking is no more warranted by abstract principles than it is successful in the results that it produces. The same opinion is held by M'Culloch. He says—

> "Coins charged with a seignorage equal to the expense of coinage do not pass at a higher value than what naturally belongs to them, but at that precise value; whereas, if the expense of coinage be defrayed by the State, coins pass at less than their real value. A sovereign is of greater utility and value than a piece of pure unfashioned gold bullion of the same weight; because, while it is as well fitted as bullion for being used in the arts, it is, owing to the coinage, better adapted for being used as money, or in the exchange of commodities. On what principle, then, should Government decline to charge a seignorage or duty on coins, equal to the expense of coinage —that is, to the value which it adds to the coins?"

That being the case, then, I think the authorities fairly establish for us that there ought to be some seignorage charged upon coin.

But the question still remains—what seignorage? This question is answered in a Paper which some time ago I laid on the table of the House, and which I dare say has attracted the attention of hon. Members — a Paper signed by the Master of the Mint and Colonel Smith, the former Master of the Mint at Calcutta—two of the highest authorities that could give an opinion on the subject. In that Paper they say that it is the duty of the State to require such a seignorage as would indemnify it for the expense of coinage in the first place, for re-coinage when worn out, and also for the wear and tear, or for the bullion that would be required in restoring the coin to the state in which it was when first issued. They argue this matter in the most clear and conclusive manner, and the conclusion they come to is that a charge of £1 8*s.* 1½*d.* for every 100 sovereigns would be sufficient not only to indemnify the State for coining and re-coining, but also for the wear and tear the coin might undergo. They propose that every year the sovereigns coined eighteen years before should be called in and re-coined, and they prove that by a moderate charge of this kind, amounting to about 1 2-5ths per cent, the coinage of the country could be maintained in its integrity. The question of mintage at this time I shall not push further; though it seems to me that the arguments in favour of the course I have explained are exceedingly strong and convincing. But I am bound to say that there is an argument against it which must be considered, though I have never seen it brought forward in any essay. It has been assumed that if the State gives the coinage for nothing, or manufactures the bullion that is brought to the Mint, making a charge for the labour, the result is exactly the same and the coin is of the same value. No one is more opposed than I am to any attempt to tamper with the current value of the sovereign. Anything which would alter the current value of the sovereign — that is, the value of the sovereign wherever it is legal tender—and oblige a man to make calculations how much more he should pay or receive for the sovereign than he is accustomed to pay or receive, would be impossible to enforce in this country. Now if you charge a mintage for the sovereign, you raise its current value. At present we sell the sovereign as a manufactured article for bullion of the same weight, and a certain number of sovereigns for a fixed amount of bullion having just the weight of these sovereigns. But suppose we ask more for the sovereign than we do now—suppose we require 1 or 2 per cent more, it is quite evident that nobody will come to exchange bullion for sovereigns until the sovereigns have risen to a value that will make it worth his while to do so—that is, till they have risen to the value of the extra percentage demanded. It must be remembered that sovereigns are perpetually being destroyed. They are lost in ships, they are melted down, they cease to circulate, and if the supply of them by Government be arrested by an impediment placed in their way, such as an extra price, of course no more sovereigns will be coined until they become so raised in value as to come up to the price that the Government demands for them. The effect of a seignorage in raising the value of the coin is thus described by Adam Smith—

> "Were the private people who carry their gold and silver to the Mint to pay themselves for the coinage, it would add to the value of those metals in the same manner as the fashion does to that of plate. Coined gold and silver would be more valuable than uncoined. The seignorage, if it was not exorbitant, would add to the bullion the whole value of the duty; because the Government having everywhere the exclusive privilege of coining, no coin can come to market cheaper than they think proper to afford it."

Ricardo expresses a similar opinion, as follows:—

> "It appears, then, that although a given weight of bullion can never exceed in value a given weight of coin, a given weight of coin may exceed in value a given weight of bullion by the whole expense of seignorage, however great that seignorage may be, provided that there was effectual security against the increase of money through the imitation of the coins by illegal means."

And the following passage occurs in Mr. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*:—

> "If Government, however, throws the expense of coinage, as is reasonable, upon the holder, by making a charge to cover the expense (which is done by giving back rather less in coin than has been received in bullion, and is called levying a seignorage), the coin will rise to the extent of the seignorage above the value of the bullion. If the Mint kept back 1 per cent to pay the expense of coinage, it would be against the interest of the holders of bullion to have it coined until the coin was more valuable than the bullion by at least that fraction. The coin, therefore, would be kept 1 per cent higher in value, which could only be by keeping it 1 per cent less in quantity, than if its coinage were gratuitous."

And Mr. M'Culloch says—

> "A small seignorage or duty upon the coinage of both gold and silver would probably increase still more the superiority of those metals in coin above an equal quantity of either of them in bullion. The coinage would, in this case, increase the value of the metal coined in proportion to the extent of this small duty; for the same reason that the fashion increases the value of plate in proportion to the price of that fashion. The superiority of coin above bullion would prevent

> the melting down of the coin, and would discourage its exportation. If upon any public exigency it should become necessary to export the coin the greater part of it would soon return again of its own accord. Abroad it could sell only for its weight in bullion. At home it would buy more than that weight. There would be a profit, therefore, in bringing it home again."

Therefore, if the Government were to demand a seignorage of 1 per cent, it would really raise the sovereign to a value of 1 per cent beyond its present value; and everybody who owed money would pay 1 per cent more than he bargained for, and everyone who received money would receive 1 per cent more than he had a right to expect. That is the conclusion which Mr. M'Culloch has come to, and he states it as an argument against the imposition of a mintage. I think the difficulty might be perfectly well met by deducting the payment from the sovereign, instead of requiring 1 per cent to be paid in money at the Mint; for it is no matter how you take it, whether by a money payment of 1 per cent, or 2*d.* for one sovereign, or by giving 122¼ grains of gold instead of 123¼. Whether you take it from the sovereign or take it in the shape of money payment, it does not matter to the State; but the difference is that, in the first case, the sovereign will be worth 2*d.* more than it is now; in the second case, the 2*d.* will be deducted from the metal of which the sovereign is made, and it will retain its present value. If there be a seignorage we must make up our minds to a deduction from the value of the sovereign to the amount of the seignorage we charge, and that not with the view of altering but retaining the value of the sovereign. Unless you take something from its value the effect must necessarily be to raise the coin beyond the value of the bullion for which it is given in exchange. I apologize for going into these matters, but really they are of great practical interest. I am not even proposing anything to the House new, but I merely wish to ventilate the subject, and give hon. Gentlemen and the public at large the means of thinking over this matter, and forming a judgment on a very curious question and one of great interest. There is another side to the transaction, and that relates to the question of an international coinage, to which the hon. Gentleman has called my attention. Well, the French Government have put themselves into communication with us. They have written to me on the subject of international coinage, and wish to know what steps the Government of England are willing to take in the matter. I was in no condition to give any definite answer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer can speak with no other breath than that of the House of Commons, and until I knew the feeling of the House of Commons I could not venture to give any opinion; but in my answer I ventured to go thus far. There are two things perfectly plain — the one that, under any circumstances, we could not have any hope of establishing an international coinage — on the chance of which I do not wish to dilate now—with a country that has two standards. France has a gold and a silver standard. A gold and a silver standard is not a double, but an alternate standard. The two metals are always fluctuating in their relations to each other; it is in the nature of things for the cheaper metal for the time being to drive out the dearer. Therefore, when the silver standard drives the gold coin out of circulation, it leaves us nothing to compare our international coin with except the silver standard, to which it would have no exact relation. And so I ventured to say, in answer to the question, that it would be impossible to hold out hopes of assimilation until France made up her mind to give up the silver standard and have only a gold standard; and I am happy to say that France is favourable to the abandonment of her silver standard, as I gather from the Report of a Commission on the subject which I have received. Again, it seems to me, on abstract principles, that we should never have an international coinage, unless the coin were identical in weight and fineness, and unless the seignorage charged on it were identical in both countries; because, if I am right in my view, that the value of coin is affected by the terms on which it is put into circulation—that is, the amount of mintage charged for it—then, on the supposition of having different mintages, we should have coin put into circulation having different values. People would take their gold to be coined where the thing could be done most cheaply, and thus the coin for which the higher mintage was paid would be reduced in value by the more abundant produce of the cheaper mint. That is all I have ventured to say in reference to the matter to the French Government, and I trust that I have not gone beyond the proper limit in saying it. The conditions which I have mentioned are really elementary conditions of the whole question. But I wish here to point out that I believe it is possible for England and France, if they can make up their minds to give up a little of their prejudices for the sake of the great advantage of having an international coinage, to obtain that object, and I will just show the House how that could be done. The French are proposing to coin a 25-franc gold piece, 5 francs more than the Napoleon. That would be less in value than the sovereign by 22 centimes, or about 2*d.* If we were about to impose a seignorage of about 1 per cent, or ·993 of a grain, and take gold to that amount from the coin, our sovereign would be identical with the 25-franc piece. It would still remain as a current coin in this country of exactly the same value as now, and it would have the additional advantage that it would be identical in value with the 25-franc piece. But, in order that that might be done, France would have to make a sacrifice on her part. I forget the mintage she charges; I believe it is between a fifth and a quarter per cent. If she could be prevailed upon to make it 1 per cent, we should have solved the problem as far as England and France are concerned, of an international coinage. The operation would be performed by modifications of the same principle—France would, as now, take the payment in money, England would deduct from her coin, and thus equality would be obtained. It is singular to remark what a number of coins in the world approach one another in value. The Spanish doubloon, the Prussian Frederick, the half-eagle of America, approach exceedingly near in value to each other, and I think it very possible, if France would meet us in this way—should Parliament be induced to look at the matter from the point of view I have put it—we might come to some arrangement by which we should get the blessing of one coinage throughout Europe, a great step in civilization. These are the remarks I had to make to the House. They are not given with any great confidence in my own opinion. All I am anxious to do before we separate is to give to hon. Gentlemen and the country at large a subject for consideration. It appears to me that the subject is not so difficult as might be supposed; and that by a single measure we may secure to ourselves the great benefit of saving all the expense incurred on our own gold coinage, without imposing those expenses on anyone else, and at the same time of striking a coin which would have the advantage of an international circulation.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the right hon. Gentleman had not stated whether he would grant the Papers he had asked for.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the hon. Gentleman had not stated what were the Papers he asked for. It was not usual to give the correspondence between Departments of the Government. At present, he really did not know what were the Papers for which the hon. Gentleman moved; but if the hon. Gentleman would put himself in communication with the Government they would give him all the Papers they could. Of course the hon. Gentleman was quite aware that he could not move for their production on that Motion, and therefore he would lose nothing by acceding to his suggestion.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had stated in his speech what Papers he wished to move for, and the Secretary of the Treasury had just promised to give them.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER thought in that case it was hardly worth the right hon. Gentleman's while to ask him again for them.

IRELAND—FENIAN CONVICT O'DONOVAN ROSSA.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. G. H. MOORE said, that on the 4th of June last the following Question was put to the Home Secretary by the hon. Member for Kilkenny (Sir John Gray):—

> "If his attention has been directed to the statement published in one of the Irish newspapers, apparently on authority, to the effect that the prison authorities so secured the hands of one of the political prisoners by manacles behind his back, that he could neither dress nor undress, or raise food to his mouth, and continued this cruelty for thirty-three days; and if the statement be true, was the circumstance reported to the Home Office, and is there any objection to place the

Report before the House, with a statement as to whether the officer guilty of this cruelty was reprimanded or otherwise dealt with, and how?"—[3 *Hansard*, cxcvi. 1238-9.]

To that Question, the Home Secretary replied—

"I am obliged to my hon. Friend for making this inquiry, for it is clear that the statement he has just made, if true, ought to be explained; if not true, it ought to be contradicted."—[*Ibid.* 1239.]

The Home Secretary went on to describe various acts of violence committed by the prisoner while in confinement, and then proceeded to say that the facts were these—

"The prisoner having committed these acts of violence, and being a very powerful man—so powerful that it required three or four warders to master him—was for a while manacled with his hands behind his back. But, so far from being kept in this condition thirty-five days, he was only so for a part of a day; but when he took his meals the handcuffs were placed in front, so that he was able to take his meals without difficulty. The punishment of manacling a man with his hands behind his back is never inflicted except when prisoners are so violent that they cannot be restrained in any other way. Rossa's handcuffs were never on at night."—[*Ibid.* 1241.]

That was reported in *The Times* in the first person—a test of care and accuracy in reporting; and in a leading article on the following day in *The Times*, this version of the right hon. Gentleman's speech was given—

"It is quite true that the prisoner's hands were tied behind his back as an indispensable precaution, but only for a few hours."

About three weeks after that he himself received a letter from a solicitor in London, enclosing a statement purporting to have been made by a warder employed in Chatham Prison at the time that cruelty was alleged to have been perpetrated. And, although not then aware how far he was empowered to use the name or the deposition of the writer, he lost no time in informing the right hon. Gentleman that he had received a formal contradiction of the statement he had made in the House, in order to give him an opportunity of again referring to the authorities of the prison and verifying the statement. When he subsequently read in the House the deposition of which he had given the Home Secretary notice, the right hon. Gentleman, with something less than his usual courtesy and fairness, objected to the course he had taken in not giving him previous notice of the name of his informant, and that taunt from the right hon. Gentleman was received with those peculiar cheers which were always heard on those (the Government) Benches whenever by any accident a Minister of State made use of an unjust or ungenerous expression. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the whole matter involved in the statement originally made, in the contradiction which the right hon. Gentleman gave to that statement, and in the contradiction which he himself had read of the right hon. Gentleman's contradiction resolved itself into a question of the comparative credibility of a dismissed warder and the authorities of Chatham Prison. But since then two Members of that House had seen the prisoner, who, in their presence, and in the presence of the deputy governor of Chatham Prison, distinctly and solemnly averred that he had been manacled, as originally stated, for thirty-five days, from five o'clock in the morning to seven in the evening. [Mr. BRUCE: The original statement was that he was manacled day and night.] He raised no dispute whatever as to whether the punishment inflicted on the prisoner was proper or not—a point altogether wide of the question now before them. He believed that no man in the House was more inclined to treat these unfortunate persons with clemency and kindness than the right hon. Gentleman; but the question at issue was one of a more important character than the offence committed by the prisoner or the punishment inflicted on him; it was whether a Minister of State had been induced by the representations of the authorities of the prison to make in that House a statement which was directly opposed to the facts of the case. He was sure that neither the House, nor public opinion, nor the right hon. Gentleman himself would allow that to remain a moot question. If it were true that that prisoner was manacled for only a day, or part of a day, or for a few hours more or less, then, of course, whether through aberration of mind or otherwise, the man was utterly unworthy to be believed on his word. But if it was substantially true that he was manacled for thirty-five days, as had been stated, then the governor of Chatham Prison had conveyed as deliberate an untruth as had ever been conveyed to a Secretary of State. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would take care that such an investigation of that matter was made as would satisfy the public mind on the facts of the case one way or the other; and no kind of investigation would satisfy the public mind unless the prisoner was allowed to be represented by some professional man of character and ability.

MR. BLAKE said, as he was one of the Members alluded to by the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. G. H. Moore) as having visited Chatham Convict Prison, to inquire into the truth of the statements made respecting the manacling, for a long period, of O'Donovan Rossa, he begged to give the House a short detail of what he heard and the impression made on him. His hon. Friend the Member for Cork County, (Mr. Downing) was desirous that he should accompany him when he went to ascertain whether the allegations contained in the *Irishman* newspaper were true respecting the treatment of the prisoner. He (Mr. Blake) accordingly applied to the Secretary of State for the Home Department for permission to visit the prison and interrogate O'Donovan on the subject. This was freely granted, the Secretary of State expressing a strong desire that the truth should be ascertained. On Friday last he and his hon. Friend went. In accordance with the order of the Secretary of State the prisoner, O'Donovan Rossa, was produced. His statement was to the effect that about fifteen months ago—soon after he was transported to Chatham, in consequence of charges of breaches of discipline, and especially the assault on the governor—his hands were manacled behind his back for thirty-five days, from five in the morning until seven in the evening, except at meal times, when he was handcuffed in front, to enable him to take his food with a spoon. The deputy governor, Major Farquharson, who was present, positively contradicted this statement, saying it was impossible that it could be; but the prisoner as strongly re-asserted it. He (Mr. Blake) and the hon. Member for Cork then went to the office, where they met the other deputy governor; they repeated the statement of the prisoner. He, too, said it was impossible, and that the records of the prison would prove that no convict had been placed in irons in the manner described for so long a time. He retired to consult the records; on his return he said he did not deem himself at liberty, without authority, to produce or state what was on the records of the prison. Accordingly, he and his hon. Friend were left without any information as to what the records would really prove. Against the resolute assertion of the prisoner there was nothing opposed except the *ipsi dixit* of two gentlemen, neither of whom were officers of the prison when the alleged occurrence took place. The governor, who might have thrown more light on the matter, was absent. These and other circumstances inclined him and the hon. Member for Cork to believe that the statement of the prisoner was true. With respect to the violence of O'Donovan, especially his outrage on the governor—and a very disgraceful outrage it certainly was, if the perpetrator could be regarded as being in a state of mind which rendered him an accountable being—he wished to observe that, from the extraordinary things the prisoner was said to have done at the time, the frenzy he appeared to have been in, and other circumstances which were stated, he came to the conclusion that O'Donovan must have been deranged at the time that the deplorable occurrence had taken place with respect to the governor. The prisoner himself stated that on his arrival from Milbank—no other political prisoner being then at Chatham—he was put to work with nine ordinary convicts; that he suffered many annoyances from them, disliked their association, and requested to be put to any labour apart from them; that, on this being refused, he became exasperated, and then begun those acts of insubordination for which he states he was so severely punished. They subsequently saw Richard Burke, who well deserved the high terms in which the Secretary of State had spoken of him when the subject was last before the House; he was, indeed, as the Secretary of State said "bearing his fate like a man." He disdained to make any complaint about himself, but made some representations on behalf of his companions. He looked delicate and emaciated; and it was only when he (Mr. Blake) and the hon. Member for Cork pressed him as to the cause of his looking so ill, that he said he was unable, owing to an intestinal complaint, to use the gruel for breakfast and supper, and had consequently been obliged to use bread and water for these two meals for some months. Still, he wished it to be understood that he did not urge this as a complaint, as he was resolved to bear with everything without a murmur. Anyone who saw this man, let him even condemn the course he took, could not but feel admiration for the fortitude he displayed. They would also feel it hard to believe that one who seemed to care so little about himself, and yet showed such kindly solicitude for others, could have been a party to running the risk of the loss of many lives in order to secure a benefit for himself. Indeed, at last, it was being admitted that even those who were known to be engaged in the attempt to rescue him never contemplated that such a fearful catastrophe would have happened—the best proof of which was, that some of themselves perished in it. The food given to the prisoners, as shown to them, appeared to be good, but the quantity for breakfast deficient by four ounces of bread. The report that had got out, that, after the hon. Member for Mayo's speech, some of the prisoners were put out of hospital and sent to hard labour, was incorrect. None of them had been in hospital for some time, except Halpin, a few months ago, and none of those at Chatham were at present at hard labour. On his return the same night from Chatham, he (Mr. Blake) sought out the Home Secretary, and made a strong representation to him as to the necessity of at once directing that Richard Burke should get nourishing food that he could make use of, or that otherwise he would be likely to fall into consumption. The right hon. Gentleman listened to his representations with the greatest attention, and promised at once to have the prisoner's case inquired into, with a view of having whatever diet given to him that was necessary for the preservation of his health. In common justice he must say that he believed there never was a man in his position possessed of stronger feelings of justice and humanity than the Home Secretary. He had no doubt that he had done everything in his power consistently with the law and what he considered his duty, to mitigate the lot of the political prisoners. It was not the Home Secretary's fault that the law subjected them to the same punishment as criminals convicted of the worst offences. He therefore had the greater confidence in appealing to him to go a step farther, and recommend Her Majesty to set these men free. They had suffered a great deal. To anyone, no matter what privations and hardships they might have been accustomed to outside, the fate of a convict was a dreadful one. The iron discipline, enforced silence, utter solitude for many hours, absence of interesting occupation, and separation from home and friends, rendered the punishment even to the most hardened terrible to endure; but to men like many of the political prisoners, well educated and accustomed to refinement and comfort, the horror of their situation was difficult to realize. Public opinion was now strongly inclining to the feeling that men for political offences ought not to be subjected to the same degrading punishment as those who had been guilty of heinous crimes. It seemed, indeed, hard that a man who violated the law in the assertion of a political opinion he entertained, no matter how erroneous it might be, should be classed and treated like a common robber. He had too good an opinion of the Home Secretary's enlightenment and high-mindedness to think that he would subscribe to such a doctrine. Whatever the political offences of these men might be, they had paid a terrible penalty. This ought to be considered, as well as the present peaceable state of Ireland and the strong feeling which had existed there in favour of an amnesty. The Government could not be blamed for imprisoning those who opposed it as those men had done; but sound policy, as well as humanity, dictated that when they had gone through so much, and when there was no longer danger to be apprehended, mercy should be extended to them. The remedial measure which Government had lately passed and what was expected from the land question would go far to restore peace and prosperity in Ireland. It was the true way to make the people grateful and loyal; and the House might rely that no act would be felt more gracious, or gratify the majority of the country more, than to set free those on whose behalf he had, he feared, but feebly pleaded.

Mr. BRUCE said, that as this was a question affecting the character of public servants, he hoped that by the indulgence of the House he might be allowed to address them again on the Motion for adjournment. He was anxious, first of all, it should be clearly understood that this punishment, whether excessive or otherwise, was inflicted upon Rossa for an act of insubordination only, and not in consequence of his being a Fenian prisoner. The complaint was, that he had had his hands tied behind his back for thirty-five days, and it was added in an Irish newspaper that he had been manacled night and day, so that at meal times he had to lap up food like a dog. The answer he (Mr. Bruce) gave was, that this was not true; that the prisoner had to be manacled for an act of insubordination, but was manacled only during a portion of the day, and not at all at night or when he had his meals. In consequence, however, of the statement made by his hon. Friend (Mr. G. H. Moore), he had ordered an inquiry by one of the Directors of Prisons. Major Farquharson, the deputy governor who was present at the interview between his hon. Friend (Mr. Blake) and the prisoner, stated to the Director that the latter gave a somewhat different account to that given by his hon. Friend. Major Farquharson said—

"The prisoner stated that he had had his hands handcuffed behind his back the greater portion of thirty-five days, and that he had frequently had to eat his meals on his belly like a dog, and he gave the exact dates. Mr. Blake and Mr. Downing then expressed themselves satisfied with everything concerning the prisoner's treatment, with the exception of this one point—namely, the mode and duration of his being handcuffed."

The governor was then called upon to explain what had actually occurred, and what was really the punishment inflicted on this man. He would read the questions and answers—

"'Did you give an order that the convict O'D. Rossa should be placed in handcuffs after he committed the assault on the 16th of June, 1868? If so, state the circumstances under which it was given.'—'The day after the assault was committed I went on leave for three days, giving over charge to Captain Harvey, who requested to know, before I left, whether I would authorize his placing convict O'D. Rossa in handcuffs with his hands behind him, the prisoner being then in such an excited state that some severe measure of restraint seemed requisite. I authorized his doing so, provided they were taken off at night.' 'Do you remember how long he was restrained, he being handcuffed behind his back?'—'As I was absent on leave I cannot exactly say, but on being called upon to state in May last the length of time passed by Rossa with his hands behind him, I sent for the warder who had been doing duty in the separate cells, who stated that, to the best of his belief, it was only for one day. To convince myself of the truth of his statement, I desired him to bring me his separate cell-book, which confirmed his statement. I also sent for the chief warder's occurrence-book, which corroborated the entry in the separate cell-book. I then felt no further doubt on the subject, and considered the evidence thus produced quite conclusive.' 'On subsequent visits after the assault was the prisoner handcuffed behind his back?'—'I have no recollection of ever having seen him with his handcuffs behind his back. No other order was given by me for him to be handcuffed behind his back between the 16th of June and the 23rd of July, 1868, nor has he ever been so restrained more than a few hours at a time, except on the occasion above referred to.'"

The chief warder was asked—

"'Were you in charge of the separate cells on the 16th of June, 1868, when convict O'D. Rossa was confined for assaulting the governor?'—'Yes.' 'Was he placed in irons on reception at the separate cells?'—'To the best of my belief he was not.' 'Was he ever handcuffed with his hands behind his back?—'He was.' 'How often, and when?'—'Cannot exactly say; but whenever the governor's order was given for the use of handcuffs it was invariably entered in the separate cell-book. It is so long ago that I cannot exactly say how long he was handcuffed behind.' 'Was he handcuffed behind for so long a period as one month?'—'Oh, no. I doubt whether the period extended to three days.' 'Were the handcuffs invariably removed at meal times and at night?'—'Yes.' 'Do you remember the prisoner being placed in handcuffs on the morning of the 17th of June, 1868, and who gave you the order?'—'I can't give the exact date, but it was on the morning the governor went on leave after the assault. Captain Harvey gave me a verbal order personally, but I cannot remember whether he specified the hands being behind the back or not.' 'Would you place the handcuffs behind without an order to that effect?'—'No.' 'Is it customary to record in the separate cell-book all cases of prisoners handcuffed behind?'—'Yes, in all cases.' 'You cannot state the exact time the prisoner was kept in handcuffs behind; do you think it could have been a week, of course, assuming that they were removed at night?'—'I do not.'"

Captain Hardy, the deputy governor, was asked—

"'Were you on duty as deputy governor on the 16th of June, 1868, at this prison, and do you remember convict O'D. Rossa being under punishment in separate cells for an assault on the governor?'—'I was on duty on the 17th and 18th, and remember the occurrence. I think I visited the prisoner in the separate cells on the 18th.' 'Was O'D. Rossa then in handcuffs?'—'Yes, with his hands behind his back.' 'Did you visit him daily after that?'—'Not daily, but alternately, day by day, with Captain Harvey.' 'Did you see him more than once with his hands behind his back?' —'Not more than once, and that was on the 18th.' 'After the third day following the assault can you say with confidence whether the prisoner had his hands behind his back during the remaining portion of his punishment?'—'I am confident he had not.' 'During the time the prisoner was handcuffed behind, were the handcuffs ever removed?'—Yes, at night and at meal times.'"

He admitted that some doubt existed as to the length of time during which the prisoner had been handcuffed—whether that period was, not thirty-five, but one, two, or three days. Then came the evidence of Dr. Burns, the medical officer, who was asked—

> "'Did you visit the prisoner daily while under confinement?'—Answer, 'I did.' When you visited him was he handcuffed?' — 'He was.' 'How was he handcuffed — with his hands behind his back or in front?'—'Part of the time in front, part of the time behind his back.'—'Did you often see him handcuffed behind his back?'—Answer, "No.' —'How often did you see him so handcuffed?'—'Three days.' 'Did the three days you speak of follow immediately after the assault?' — 'Yes.' 'How was he handcuffed for the remaining portion of the time?'—'With his hands in front.'—'Do you think that as a means of restraint it was necessary to handcuff him behind?'—Answer, 'Yes; he was in an excited state for some time.'"

There was also the evidence of Chief Warder Turner, who, being asked whether he ever saw the prisoner handcuffed behind, answered in the affirmative, adding, in reply, to the question, "How often?" "I cannot say the exact time, whether one, two, or three days. There is only one entry of the prisoner being handcuffed behind, and that was on the 17th of June, the day after the assault." Then there was the following note of Captain Stopford, the Director who conducted the examination:—

> "The books are examined, and I find only one entry of the prisoner being handcuffed behind, and that was on the 17th of June, 1868. There are other entries of his having been handcuffed, but not behind. It appears to be the invariable practice to enter all prisoners handcuffed behind as a measure of restraint in this book."

Now, it was perfectly true that the Warder Kaye, to whom the hon. Member for Mayo referred, did make a different statement, and inquiry had been made as to the character and trustworthiness of that witness. He found that he had—

> "Joined the service on the 4th of April, 1865; that in June, 1868, he was placed on second probation of three months for making a frivolous and unsubstantial report against another officer, having during the whole of his service been reported very frequently for neglect and irregularities. While so under probation he was several times reported for neglect, irregularity, and insubordination, and consequently was dismissed the service in 1868. The governor reports that this officer never was in charge of the treason-felony prisoners, and could not have communicated with them except by talking through the doors of their cells on one or two occasions when he was patrolling the hall where they were while the regular officer was absent at dinner. The governor considered him to be a man whose word could not be relied on entirely."

The statement of Kaye was supported by another man named Douglas, but that witness was also regarded as being untrustworthy. It appeared that during the last five years he had been reported five or six times every year, and that this year he had been reported five times, once for telling a falsehood as to the finding of clandestine correspondence on a prisoner, and making a false statement against another officer which he afterwards denied. Those were the two persons on whose evidence the statement was made in support of the prisoner's own statement; but, in opposition to that evidence, there was the evidence of the medical man, supported by the evidence of the officers and warders. There was, besides, the evidence of the two deputy governors who visited the prisoner repeatedly, and the evidence of the entry in the book itself, which had been examined by Captain Stopford. Therefore, although there was, he admitted, a certain amount of doubt as to the exact length of time during which the prisoner was handcuffed behind, yet hon. Members would, he thought, be disposed to think that the evidence of the entry in the book, as well as of the persons more immediately in charge of the prisoner, was on the whole the most trustworthy. He was, at all events, quite satisfied that the information which had been given by the governor had been given on evidence which seemed to be sufficient, and not without careful inquiry from those whom he believed to be fully informed on the subject. As to the prisoner Burke, it was true that he was not able to eat the gruel which was provided for the other prisoners. The medical officer, however, stated that in his opinion it was fancy on the part of the prisoner, and that he doubted whether it would disagree with him. But, be that as it might, orders had been issued by the medical officer to supply him with food which would give him sufficient nutriment.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, he was glad the subject had been brought under the consideration of the House, and he would take the opportunity of making an appeal to the Government as to the wisdom and expediency of extending the clemency of the Crown to all the political prisoners in Ireland, declaring it to be his solemn belief that no possible injury, but great advantage, would be the result to the peace and welfare of the country.

MR. STACPOOLE made a similar appeal to the Government.

RAILWAY GUARDS AND PASSENGERS COMMUNICATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he was enabled to inform the House whether any and what steps had been taken to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of Parliament for securing the means of communication between the passengers and the guards on railways? There had been a delay of eight months in taking the necessary measures with that object, and something in the shape of a temporary method had, he understood, been adopted in some instances, a rope being extended from carriage to carriage. A letter had appeared in *The Times* within the last two or three days which gave reason to believe that the railway companies had not done all that was required of them in the matter. On the whole, he was led to the belief that the railway companies had not, as a general rule, established any uniform or efficient means of communication between the passengers and guard. Consequently, numerous letters of complaint had been sent to the public Press, and various newspapers had drawn attention to the subject. The result of the twelve months' delay had been that the railway companies proposed to establish a cord communication. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would state his opinion whether a cord or rope communication was the most efficient that could be provided. The South Eastern Railway had been fitted up with Mr. Deacon's apparatus, and the result had been that in 500 cases there had been only three failures, and in another 714 cases only seven failures, and these even had been accounted for. Colonel Yolland, in his valuable Report on this subject, had strongly condemned the cord system. He would now read to the House the opinion expressed by Mr. Martin. ["No, no!" *and* "Agreed!"] At all events, as this was a matter affecting the safety of railway travellers, he hoped the House would permit him to state the objections which had been urged by scientific and practical men against the adoption of the rope system. Communication by means of a rope placed outside the carriage would certainly not be efficient. Ladies and infirm old gentlemen could not put their heads out of the window to pull the rope, while the amount of slack was so great that it would require considerable strength to communicate with the guard. It had likewise been urged that in winter time the frost and snow would prevent the rope system from acting, and that, indeed, its adoption was a compliance with the letter but not with the spirit of the statute. In conclusion, he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether any railway companies had neglected to comply with the provisions of the Act; and, if so, whether they had assigned any reasons for such non-compliance?

LIABILITIES OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. C. DENISON rose to call attention to a case which was not at all confined in its principle and legal bearings to the interests of railway companies and proprietors, but which equally affected the liability of every associated company, every private individual who owned a warehouse or manufactory, and every professional man who had an office for daily business. In thus trespassing upon the House, he had no wish or intention to invite expression of opinion on the merits of the case itself, or on the settlement, which was now beyond litigation or dispute. Therefore, after citing the bare facts, it would not be necessary for him to allude either to plaintiff or defendant. The circumstances were as follows:—On the 17th of February, 1868, a lady professor of dancing travelled in a third-class carriage by an early train from Boston to Spalding; distance, seventeen miles, fare 1*s.* 6*d.* On alighting at Spalding she went into the ladies' waiting-room, and in turning to pass out she caught her foot in the seam of the carpet, which, as she stated in evidence, had become unsewn, the thread having worn away. She fell, and in so falling caused, as she alleged, a serious injury to the lower portion of her spine, which incapacitated her afterwards from following her profession for many months. She claimed at first £1,000 damages, which (for technical reasons) were subsequently increased by Judge's order to £10,000. The railway company pleaded non-liability and absence of all negligence or default. The learned Judge, he believed, at an early stage of the inquiry, before medical witnesses were called and after they had been called, ruled unhesitatingly that the company were liable. There remained, then, only the question of compensation, which was settled by consent at £1,500, because it was deemed inadvisable to press the case. This, no doubt, was a very extreme case, a very unusual case; and were it not for fear of giving offence, where it was least his intention to do so, he should say that it was an exaggerated view almost amounting to burlesque upon reasonable liability. As well might it be ruled that if one stone in a paved courtyard of a station was rougher than another or an inch higher than its neighbour, and a passenger tripped over the offending stone, that the proprietor was liable for costly damages. He was not a lawyer, and was perhaps incapable of appreciating those subtle refinements which went to make up the legal view of liability; but he put it to anyone who was the proprietor of any office what his notion would be if anybody in passing from his premises met with an accident, went away, and successfully claimed excessive damages. Where railway companies or directors were concerned every small injury or wrong assumed exaggerated proportions. The plaintiff, the witnesses, and the professional men all took an exaggerated view, and verdicts were given not with reference to the injury sustained, but to the ability of the railway companies to pay. He asked the attention of the House to this subject on public grounds alone; and the broad proposition he laid down was this —It was not the interest of the public to relieve railway companies from liability in proven cases of negligence and neglect, but neither was it the interest of the public to hold them liable for injuries in such a case as he had detailed. If courts of justice were to act as insurance arbitrators in every case of accident between the public and railway companies, then railway companies ought to have the powers of insurance companies and charge a special rate in proportion to the risk they ran. Railway companies did not ask to be relieved of general liability; they only asked that damages should be apportioned to the fare received and the distance run. He hoped when he brought this subject forward next Session he should have the sympathy and assistance of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. BRIGHT: The answer I shall give to the Question of the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) will be very short and simple. As the House is aware an Act was passed last year for the purpose of compelling railway companies to establish some mode of communication between passengers, guards, and drivers. The management of the affair was, to a certain extent, placed in the hands of the Board of Trade, and after the Act was passed there were offered to the Board—I believe that I should be within the mark if I said—many scores of plans. I believe from first to last 200 or 300 plans were offered to them, by which such a communication could be established. We have many sagacious men connected with the Board of Trade, and I say nothing to their discredit when I admit that they could not decide absolutely what was to be done. The course taken was to communicate with the leading men that manage the great railways of the country, and ask their opinion, for they have just as much interest as the public in preventing accidents and saving the lives of their passengers. The companies formed a committee of their ablest managers, and I need not say that some of the very ablest men in the country are connected with the management of the railways. The result was that they suggested — after having examined all the plans—that a particular plan should be adopted. The Board of Trade thought it was infinitely better for the public that they should act in this matter along with the intelligent managers of the companies rather than sanction or determine upon any particular plan of their own. Now, the plan that was sanctioned was that to which my hon. Friend referred in terms, I thought, almost of contempt. The Act fixed the 1st of April, as the date at which this communication was to be established; but the interval allowed was too short, because it took some months to determine how it was to be done, and then necessarily it would take some months more to fit up the rolling stock of the companies. The Board of Trade exercising the power given to them, extended the time to the 1st of August, and, so far as I know, the Act has been complied with. The hon. Gentleman says, or supposes, or suspects, for of his own knowledge he knows nothing—he does not tell the House that he has been spending his time since the 1st of August in inspecting the various railways—that no communications have been established. He has read in a paper that in certain trains on the Great Western Railway the communication was not in a condition to work with success. I have had a communication from the management, and the explanation given is this—that with all their efforts they had not been able to fit up all the carriages composing the rolling stock of the company, but had fitted as many carriages as were necessary for the ordinary traffic; but during the last few months everyone that could run away—not being a Member of Parliament—was leaving London, and the Great Western Railway Company found it necessary for the convenience of passengers to bring into use the whole power of their rolling stock, and they had to use certain carriages to which the band of connection had not been attached, and the consequence was that the mechanical contrivance was not accurately fixed, and the thing for the moment was a failure. The manager says—"I have every reason to believe that in the course of a few days the whole of the company's stock will be fitted up, and the system will be in full operation." Wherever the rope system has been sanctioned by the Board of Trade we have found that the rope is attached, and, as we have reason to believe, it is in successful operation. The hon. Member has referred to the South Western Railway, where a different system has been operation for two or three years. The directors thought that it worked sufficiently well for them, and the Board of Trade sanctioned that system upon that line; but on the lines of the North they have sanctioned the rope system, and it is in operation. I will undertake to say that if the Board of Trade had sanctioned any other system some hon. Member would have have been found to put a similar question to me, and would probably have been able to bring as many arguments against that other system as the hon. Member has urged against the system which the Board of Trade has sanctioned. We have done the best we could, on consultation with able men connected with the railways, and the plan sanctioned is in operation, and I say it is not fair to the railways—within four days of the time fixed for bringing the plan of communication into effect—[Mr. H. B. Sheridan: Four months after the time allowed by the Act.]—The Act no doubt said the 1st of April; but the Board of Trade finding the time insufficient, extended the period to the 1st of August. But even if a longer time had been necessary, what then? We are not endeavouring to entrap the railways, but to deal generously and fairly by them as with the public. We have endeavoured to do so. But to get up—and without speaking from his own knowledge—from his having travelled on the railways—[Mr. H. B. Sheridan said, he had travelled on the lines]. I did not understand the hon. Gentleman to say so in his speech—to get up within four or five days of the time allowed for bringing the plan into operation and bring a general charge against the railway companies after the plan had been adopted by so many competent men, and assume that nothing had been done and no effort made to promote the safety of the public, was hardly fair to the railways. I will say nothing about the Board of Trade, for we are not thin-skinned, and we do not suffer much from such criticism. As to the case referred to by the hon. Member for Yorkshire (Mr. C. Denison) it has been before a court. It may be that the Judge's ruling was entirely wrong, and the jury's verdict contrary both to law and fact. I know nothing about it. But this I know, and I will give my own opinion. I thought it one of the most monstrous cases I had ever heard of in connection with questions of compensation. My opinion is that the whole law with regard to compensation for accidents as now worked with regard to railways, is one of very serious injustice, and deserves the examination and consideration of the House. It was only the other day that I read in the newspapers of a man brought into the court on a stretcher to show the jury what a deplorable condition he was in. The Judge said that was not a wise thing to do in the case of a man so near death's door; but the man, after receiving his compensation money, was found in two or three weeks following his former avocation in perfect health.

Another similar case was mentioned where the man was going about on crutches—[An hon. MEMBER: It was the same man]—and in a few weeks after he got compensation he was following his ordinary occupation. There are, no doubt, instances from time to time of neglect and carelessness on the part of railway companies, for which they ought to suffer. But there is also a system which I consider to be no better than swindling practised upon railway companies. And if the hon. Gentleman at the beginning of next Session moves in this House for a Select Committee to inquire into this question thoroughly, with a view to justice to the companies, as well as to the general public, I think I am empowered to say that the Government will make no objection to the appointment of such a Committee, and I should be very glad if from it there should come a Report which should enable Parliament to establish a more satisfactory condition of the law than that which prevails at present.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN rose, and was about to address the House, when there arose cries of "Order!" The hon. Member said, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER said, that having already spoken the hon. Member could not make such a Motion.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, that he only wished to correct a statement of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member could make an explanation, but could not make a reply.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had charged him with bringing forward this question only five days after the Bill came into operation; but it was not known that the time had been extended.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not explanation.

MR. BRIGHT: I have stated in this House on more than one occasion that the time had been extended to the 1st of August.

MR. HENLEY said, that no one could object to the appointment of the Committee which the right hon. Gentleman had suggested. It was, however, to be wished that the right hon. Gentleman had not expressed himself so strongly, for the phrases which he employed—injustice, and so forth—led to the conclusion that he himself had prejudged the question.

CANADIAN BOUNDARIES.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT MILTON, in putting to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs the Question of which he had given notice upon this subject, said, that the information which he desired to obtain on a former occasion had been refused, however, courteously. This was not the only instance of a similar refusal. It was a singular fact that every Paper he had asked for on this subject had been refused. This made him think that there were other reasons than a simple desire to refuse that lay at the bottom of these denials. He was well aware of the importance of this question. He had watched it for years, and he had come to the conclusion that there was an intention on the part of the Government to give up some part of our possessions in America in compensation for the *Alabama* claims. He therefore felt that he should hardly be doing his duty if he did not ask what were the intentions of the Government? and he asked that question now, because if he delayed till next Session he knew he should probably be told that it would be better not to disturb the negotiations that were going on. But now no negotiations were going on. He wished, therefore, to know what was going to be done by the British Government with the island of San Juan and the group of islands connected with it? He desired to receive from the Under Secretary of State an explicit assurance that no concessions would be made as to the water boundary, which so vitally affected, not only Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, but the future of Canada as a whole. The information hitherto put before the House as to the correspondence was very much in the nature of cooked accounts, for the very Papers which he had asked for two years ago, and which were then refused to the House of Commons, were now in the possession of Congress. 350 pages of printed matter would not contain all the correspondence which had passed between the two Governments on this boundary question; whereas, during the last ten years, not fifty pages of printed matter relating to it had been vouchsafed to Parliament. The noble Viscount concluded by asking the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether he will afford an assurance to the House that no arrangements will be entered into by the Government which can in any way prejudge the question of the land or water boundaries between the British possessions and the United States, until the whole correspondence upon these subjects has been laid upon the table of the House.

MR. OTWAY said, that the House had not unwisely signified more than once its desire that there should be no discussion at the present moment of questions in controversy between the Government of this country and that of the United States; but he hoped, by a very few words, to relieve the anxiety felt by his noble Friend. There was no mystery in this matter, as he supposed; it was one of extreme simplicity. The land boundary and the water boundary formed not one, but two distinct questions occupying different positions. The land boundary question was settled. Mr. Campbell, on the part of the United States, and Colonel Hawkins, a distinguished officer of Engineers, on the part of this country, had traced the line of that boundary, the maps had been drawn up, compared, and certified, and that question was at an end. As to the water boundary, a difference of opinion had arisen between the Commissioners, as his noble Friend was aware. In 1860, Lord Russell, then Foreign Minister for this country, proposed that the matter, if it could not be settled in any other way, should be referred to arbitration; and the United States agreed to that proposition. The civil war, however, supervened, and no effect was given to that agreement, nor were further steps taken till October of last year. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) signed a Protocol under which the subject was to be referred to arbitration, and that Protocol Lord Clarendon converted into a Convention, which was now awaiting the ratification of the Senate, which would meet in December next. Under these circumstances, it was impossible for him to give the assurance asked for by the noble Viscount, because the matter had passed for the present out of the hands of the British Government, and rested entirely in those of the Senate of the United States.

Motion, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next," by leave, *withdrawn.*

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[*Lords.*]—[BILL 215.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 49 to 58 inclusive, as amended, *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Clause 59 (CLAUSE E—School committees to impose assessment upon lands and heritages to maintain new national schools).

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he should at the proper time, move that this clause be omitted. He was aware that the principle of an educational rate had to a certain extent been recognized in Scotland for many years; he would not, therefore, weary the Committee with attempting to describe that which was much more familiar to many hon. Gentlemen than to himself — namely, the educational rating system of Scotland. But he should not be open to contradiction if he said that this clause amplified that principle to a considerable extent. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had remarked that morning, upon the Motion that the Chairman do leave the Chair, that English Members had a perfect right to take exception to the introduction of principles which might be held to be precedents for legislation in regard to other parts of the United Kingdom. Now, he thought that neither the right hon. Gentleman nor any other hon. Member would feel disposed to contradict him when he said that the principle involved in this clause was likely to be made a precedent for legislation to be proposed next year. He believed that the Vice President of the Committee of Council looked upon this clause as affording a valuable groundwork for his English measure of next year. He thought the House should not allow itself to be hastily led to accept a principle so important as that which was involved in this clause. It was a principle to which he entertained an unmistakeable aversion—namely, that of a local educational rate — and he should feel it his duty to afford the Committee an opportunity of expressing an opinion in regard to it.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, the clause proposed to take away the rating power from those who at present possessed it, and to vest it in an entirely new body. In burghs, the Town Council was the body which alone had the power of making a rate; but the proposal here was to deprive the Town Council of all control over these particular rates, and to hand it over to a School Committee, upon which only three members of the Town Council at the outside could sit. He trusted that the power of levying rates would be allowed to remain with the Town Council, and with that object he moved, after the word "or" in the first line, to insert "Town Council in any burgh."

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he did not quite appreciate the objection of the hon. Gentleman to the clause, as the Town Council was to have the appointment of the School Commitee. There was nothing unconstitutional in allowing the School Committee, appointed by the Town Council, to make the assessment.

Mr. M'LAREN, in reply to the remarks of the hon. Member for York (Mr. J. Lowther), said, that if there was to be no extension of assessment, there would be no extension of education, and the 90,000 children, of whom they had heard so much, must still go without school instruction; because if there was to be no assessment, where were they to get the money to educate those children? To take it out of the Consolidated Fund would be unjust to the people of England and the people of Ireland, who would be paying £90,000 out of the £100,000 required, while Scotland herself would be paying only £10,000.

Mr. COLLINS concurred with his hon. Friend the Member for York (Mr. Lowther). He did not think there would be any use in his hon. Friend pressing his proposed Amendment, because the House was at this period composed principally of supporters of the Government. The national schools in Ireland were maintained out of the Consolidated Fund, to which Scotland contributed. His own opinion was that in the three countries national education should be paid for partly by local rates and partly by grants out of the Consolidated Fund. The first object was to induce parents to fulfil the obligations they were under to educate their children, and it should be only a last resort to provide for the interference of the State on the disregard of parental responsibility. This first object could best be attained by an extension of the voluntary system, assisted by children's pence on the one hand and State grants on the other. He protested against the system which was being adopted in this Bill being hereafter quoted as a precedent for adoption in England. It was impossible to divide against it, because the measure came before them so late in the Session. They had reached the 7th of August, for the clock pointed to a quarter to one, and many hon. Members had left town.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE added his protest against the adoption of the system; and if, any time in the future, he heard this Bill quoted as a precedent for England, he would repudiate it.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he also desired to protest against the principle of the clause, and would divide against it if the hon. Member for York led the way. He had a very strong objection to an educational rate upon visible property only.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND (Mr. Young) said, the rate was not laid upon the owners exclusively. It was laid upon the owners and occupiers of visible property, and, like the poor rate, was laid upon the owners and occupiers of all lands and hereditaments, and in their lands and hereditaments were included all houses down to a rental of £4. This rate was laid upon the owners and occupiers of all property, and therefore it was a mistake to say that it was laid upon the owners of visible property only. [Mr. Sclater-Booth: The real point is that personal property is not levied upon.] Under the Poor Law Act of Scotland, passed in 1845, an option was given to lay the assessment upon the inhabitants of parishes according to "means and substance," but that was so universally distasteful that he believed it was repudiated, and the present mode of testing the ability of persons to pay was adopted.

Dr. BREWER desired to remind the Committee that in England rates were now devoted to education, as in the case of pauper children.

Lord ELCHO hoped his hon. Friend

would not press his Motion to a division, because, if he were to succeed in striking out this clause, there would be no means of carrying out education in Scotland. The question was a very simple one. The Solicitor General had given the explanation—for which the Committee was greatly indebted to him—that occupiers would be rated as well as owners. Even taking him upon his own ground, everyone knew that the rating occupiers meant that the burden that was paid by the occupier ultimately fell on the owner. They were about to extend a principle which he believed to be sound—the principle of rating for schools. But was it right that this burden should be borne alone by property of one description? If a school, for instance, was necessary in Edinburgh, and if a rate should happen to be levied for the purpose, the question is whether the hon. Member (Mr. M'Laren) ought to pay upon the actual value of the premises and land on which his warehouses stand, or on the income which he derived from the warehouses? It was much more equitable and much more just that taxation should extend to other descriptions of property and not to real property only. His opinion was they would have to come back to "means and substance" after all. He ventured to say to his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council (Mr. W. E. Forster) that if he wished to have an Education Bill next year for England he had better get the Prime Minister to bring in a Bill rating personal property.

MR. J. LOWTHER remarked on the ominous silence of Her Majesty's Government. Question after question had been put them, but the Vice President of the Committee of Council had very wisely abstained from entering into the subject. He would withdraw his Motion, because he should not be justified in asking the House to divide.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 60 to 64, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 65 (CLAUSE L—One third the sum required to enlarge, rebuild, or erect any national school shall be paid by the Committee of Council out of parliamentary grant.

MR. MILLER moved, after "any," to insert the word "national."

Amendment proposed, in page 26, line 4, after the word "any" to insert the word "national."—(*Mr. Miller.*)

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he could not understand the meaning of the proposition. The clause included any school open to inspection, and allowed the Privy Council to deal with any such schools.

MR. MILLER asked if parish schools were included in this clause?

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Yes; and schools of all denominations.

MR. MILLER said, that in that case he would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. CRAUFURD objected to the Amendment being withdrawn.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that as the Bill now stood parochial schools were not to be liable to be converted, and it would not be right to limit it as proposed in the Amendment.

Question put, "That the word 'national' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 3; Noes 79; Majority 76.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause 66 (Grant for maintenance).

MR. CRAUFURD said, that this clause should be restored to the form in which it stood in the original Bill, and by which the Committee of Council were only allowed to make grants to schools where the same were national schools. In order to raise the question, he moved the insertion of the word "national" in line 5.

THE LORD ADVOCATE suggested that it was unnecessary again to divide on precisely the same point, and that the important question could be raised on the whole clause.

MR. CRAUFURD said, that there were many hon. Gentlemen who voted against him on the previous occasion who would probably give a reverse vote upon this Amendment. He did not want to give up the important point whether this was to be a national or denominational system. What he wanted was to strike out the special power to be left in the hands of the Council to say whether denominational grants were to be made or not. It would be unfair to place on this Board the enormous demand which would be made upon its discretion in this question of giving grants to denominational schools. Let them lay down a broad principle by Act of Parliament, and let the Board carry that out. As the clause now stood they were going to delegate to another body the power of disposing of this Parliamentary grant, and putting its hands into the public Exchequer upon a basis utterly contrary to the whole scope and intention of this Bill. He would move the omission of the words at the end of the clause, in order to insert the words—

> "It shall not be lawful for the said Committee to make any such grant aforesaid to any school not being a national school within the meaning of this Act."

Amendment proposed, in page 26, line 22, to leave out from the words "national school," to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. Craufurd.*)

Mr. MACFIE said, he did not object to the maintenance of any such denominational schools as now existed, but he distinctly objected to introduce a wedge which might split up Scotland into sects, and encourage Episcopal or Popish proselytism in every parish in Scotland. To concede that the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians might have separate schools supported by State grants was to admit that the system about to be established was national in nothing except in name.

Mr. COLLINS protested against the intolerant language which they had just heard from the hon. Member, that Roman Catholic and Episcopalian children were not to be educated. He should like to know upon what principle of toleration and justice Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, who paid their share of taxation, should be refused education?

Mr. BRIGHT appealed to his hon. Friend the Member for Leith (Mr. Macfie). It was impossible that in a case like the present one everyone could exactly have his own will. The Government had endeavoured to do the best they could; the House had shown a great disposition to meet the Government in arranging this Bill, and he hoped that his hon. Friend, with that good sense which he generally showed, would not think it necessary to take exception to an arrangement which seemed to be absolutely necessary.

Mr. MACFIE explained that he did not object to the maintenance of the present schools, but to the introduction of a system which would bring a system of proselytizing into every parish.

Mr. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, that the Government had forced through the Bill in such manner that they had not been able to discuss the one clause of vital importance in the Bill. The Lord Advocate had told them that this was to be an undenominational Bill; but he (Mr. Aytoun) said that with this clause it would be a denominational Bill. It gave unlimited power to the Board to report to the Privy Council whether there should or should not be denominational schools; and looking at the conduct of the Government it was perfectly clear that this system would be entirely denominational. This question was not understood in Scotland, as the Lord Advocate had admitted; but at this period of the morning he must content himself with protesting against that clause, unless it was amended as proposed by the hon. Member for Ayr.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he desired, before the division was taken, to explain in a sentence or two the nature of this clause. His hon. Friend (Mr. Aytoun) had said that he had admitted that in Scotland this Bill was not understood. Now, what he (the Lord Advocate) said was this—that by the course taken the Amendments which the Lords had made had in some of the remoter parts of the country been taken to be the propositions of the Government. It certainly had never occurred to him that there were two hon. Members who had so little apprehension of the real nature of this Bill as the hon. Members for Ayr and Kirkcaldy as to say that this was a denominational Bill. This was the only attempt that had been made not to limit, but rather to destroy, the denominational system. He would first explain what it was that the Bill did. The parish schools were not denominational schools, although the management was more restricted than could be wished. The other denominational schools receiving grants were by this Bill to continue to be put under undenominational inspection, and subjected to a Conscience Clause; and a machinery was provided for grafting them on to the national system. Undenominational inspection itself was a great advantage. The next question was what was to be the constitution of these national schools? These schools were to be founded by the Council, and were to be paid from the rates. Now, who could say that is the denominational system? Where was it proposed that the denominational schools were to be paid out of the rates? The provision was that these schools were to be put down by the Board, and were to be managed by an undenominational committee chosen by the rate-payers of all denominations. It was a grievous misrepresentation to say that this was a denominational system. There was nothing denominational about it. It was as purely a national system as it could be. Then came the question what was to be done with the fragmentary but important portion of the population that did not belong to the Presbyterian Church—those belonging to the Roman Catholic persuasion. It was true the Scotch schools—strict and austere as the people were in their religious opinions—had always been conducted as though under a stringent Conscience Clause, and children of all persuasions could sit upon the same bench. But that was not enough. They knew, as a matter of fact, that Roman Catholic children would not attend Protestant schools. While in this clause, therefore, they prohibited denominational grants, or rather grants in addition to voluntary effort, they left it open to the Board, where they find a population suited to that special exception, where they are satisfied that the children will not otherwise be educated, to certify that such is the case to the Privy Council, in order that the voluntary effort may be supplemented. But that did not give a denominational aspect to the fabric they were erecting.

MR. CRAUFURD said, the learned Lord Advocate had not explained why the Government had changed their opinion on this matter. He denounced the clause, for it tended to the establishment of denominationalism, and that in its very worst form.

Question put, "That the words 'erected or established more than two years,' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 74; Noes 4: Majority 70.

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Postponed clauses 23 to 47 *agreed to.*

New Clause—

(Vote for schoolmasters in old National Schools.)

"Section twenty-two of the Act of the forty-third year of George III., chapter 54, is hereby repealed, and all owners of land in the parish whose rental appears in the Land tax valuation books, and who are liable to be assessed on their valued rent for payment of schoolmasters' salary, shall be entitled to vote in the appointment of schoolmasters in old National Schools."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Clause *added.*

Other new clauses *added;* others *moved* and *negatived.*

New Clause—

(Certain occupiers of land to act with heritors in the matters of Parochial Schools, and disqualifying ministers from so acting.)

"It shall be lawful for all occupiers of land who are liable to be assessed for payment of parochial schoolmasters' salary under the Acts 43rd of the reign of His Majesty King George III., chapter 54, and the 24th and 25th of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter 107, to attend and vote at all meetings for the election of a parochial schoolmaster, and for any other matter held by the heritors pursuant to the two Acts here recited and this Act. It shall not be lawful for any parish minister *ex officio* to vote at any such meetings."—(*Mr. Miller.*)

Clause *brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 9; Noes 51: Majority 42.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, 7th August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland)* (279); Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan* (285).

Second Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans)* (280).

Committee—Report—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* (272); Dividends on Public Stocks* (269); Harbour of Galle Loan* (266); East India Loan* (267); Inclosure of Lands* (270); Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* (273); Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment* (271); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment* (227).

Report—Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment* (266).

Third Reading—Seeds Adulteration* (276); Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham)* (263); Expiring Laws Continuance* (262); Nitro Glycerine* (277); Railways Abandonment* (249); Accounts, &c. Presentation* (253), and *passed.*

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

QUESTION.

Lord REDESDALE said, he had expected that this Bill would come back from the Commons to-day. He wished to know when it would come up, and what course it was proposed to take with regard to it? He could not imagine that at so late a period of the Session it would be proceeded with.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he also had anticipated that the Bill would come back to their Lordships to-day. He now understood that it would do so on Monday, and his noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) would on Tuesday ask their Lordships to assent to the Commons' Amendments.

Lord REDESDALE said, the Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill was to be read the third time on Monday, and he protested against a Bill of such importance as the Parochial Schools Bill being considered after the passing of the Appropriation Bill — especially as almost every clause had been altered since it left this House. It would be impossible to deal with it satisfactorily on Tuesday. He would not say more now, as he hoped the Government, on due consideration, would see the necessity of not proceeding further with it this Session; but in order that there might be no surprise, he begged to give notice that on its coming up he should move that the Commons' Amendments be considered that day month.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he did not wish to discuss the matter now, as his noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) would on Tuesday explain the nature of the Amendments, and would show the desirability of settling the question this Session.

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 7th August, 1869.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Considered as amended*—Parochial Schools (Scotland) [215-265]; Charity Commissioners* [239].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan* [253]; Contagious Diseases* [255]; Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation* [254]; Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c.* [256], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Straits Settlements* [259], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Endowed Schools (No. 2) (*re-comm.*) [154].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL.—(*Lords*)—[Bill 215.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

The LORD ADVOCATE *moved* to insert, after Clause 5, the following clause:—

> "The Board shall hold their meetings in public on the following occasions:—The half-yearly meetings; meetings for the cognizance of offences under this Act; meetings for the purpose of considering orders relative to the establishment of new national schools; orders relative to the building and enlargement of school buildings or schoolmasters' houses; meetings for considering certificates to the Committee of Council for special grants from the same."

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

On the Motion of Mr. C. Dalrymple, Clauses (Regulations as to examination for certificates of competency) *added* to the Bill.

Mr. HENLEY asked the hon. and learned Lord Advocate for a statement of the gross expense that would be entailed by carrying out the provisions of the Bill.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE desired some explanation with regard to the 5th clause. Considerable anxiety was felt in Scotland with regard to the effect of the Schedule on the action of the Bill. He need not say how important it was to have some understanding on the subject of the financial effect of the Bill, because if it should happen that a rate of 3*d.* in the pound should be exacted, the whole thing might break down, and they would have to fall back upon the voluntary system after all. Moreover, it would raise some of those difficulties about the incidence of taxation which were touched upon last night. He thought, therefore, that with regard to the financial action of the Bill they should have a clear understanding on the points to which he had alluded. As to the burden of taxation, the Government had made a proposition in the

Bill which was a very liberal one with regard to Scotland, and in respect to which he did not wish to offer any opposition: but, at the same time, he thought it important that they should know clearly how it would act. He should regret above all things if the tendency should be to supersede that large amount of private and individual agency by which the education of the country was to so great an extent carried on. He knew that in regard to his own county a large portion of the schools were supported by voluntary agency, by means of a system under which those who were engaged in public works were required by the owners of those works to make a certain payment. The result was to lead to the compulsory attendance of the children, which was the dream of many hon. Members. He thought it was highly to be deprecated if this Bill were to have the effect of inducing any persons to cease their efforts, and throw the schools upon the rates. In one of the populous districts of Lanarkshire the means of education were supplied by the parochial schools, which educated a large number, and further provision was made by private means for 4,800 more. If the action of the Bill should be to throw these private subscriptions on the rates the whole arrangement must break down. Unless a satisfactory explanation could be given he thought it would be improper that the Schedule should be passed in the form in which it was proposed.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, the speech of his hon. Friend, he rather thought, went against the whole principle of the work that they had been doing in Committee for the last two or three days. His hon. Friend's view was, that it was better to have the denominational than the national system. That was really what it came to. He said he was afraid of the Bill interfering with voluntary exertion, and that it was better, in the first instance, to trust to the voluntary exertions of the people than to trust to a national system. He (the Lord Advocate) entirely and absolutely differed from him, and he was perfectly certain that the whole feeling of Scotland was wholly the other way. If the principles contended for by his hon. Friend were to be acted upon, the whole principle of the parochial schools would be upset, and they would only introduce a national system to supplement the deficiencies of voluntary contributions. His hon. Friend resided in a county of great wealth, and he formed judgment upon what he saw being done there; but he would find that in other places voluntary exertions had not done the work fully. There was, on the other hand, not the least fear that the work would ever be so done as to render voluntary efforts useless. He trusted that his hon. Friend would not insist on any change being introduced at this the last stage of the Bill.

MR. W. E. FORSTER fully believed, as far as he was able to form a judgment from the figures and facts on which the Commissioners based their Report, that, supposing the rate system succeeded to the fullest expectation of those who were in favour of it, a rate of 2*d.* in the pound would be abundantly sufficient. With regard to the cost of the new system, the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire would not probably expect at the present moment a definite estimate. He could now only give a general idea of what was likely to be the result. It was hoped that all the children in Scotland not at present at school would gradually be drawn into them, and in that case the aid given by the State would be increased in the aggregate amount, but to an expenditure so produced he imagined nobody would object. Supposing the most Utopian result to follow, and that the 510,000 children who ought to be on the rolls of the schools—not deducting the children of the upper classes and those who went to private schools—received per head the same amount of grant as that given in England—namely, 10*s.* per head, the expenditure on that score would be £250,000, or £260,000 at the very utmost. But that was a result not to be expected for many years to come. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might be under the impression that the Scotch Members desired more money per child than was given in England, but he believed that what the Scotch Members wanted from alterations in the Revised Code was not more money per child for Scotland, as against England, but that the money should be distributed according to Scotch views in reference to education, rather than according to English views. At the present moment, however, England was getting more per child than Scotland. The children were divided into three classes—agricultural, non-agricultural, and mixed; and in the year ending on August 31, 1868, the average was 9*s.* 2*d.* in the agricultural division for England, and 8*s.* 8*d.* for Scotland. In the non-agricultural division the average was 9*s.* 2¾*d.* for England, 7*s.* 7¾*d.* for Scotland. In the mixed division the average was 9*s.* 3¼*d.* in England and 8*s.* 6*d.* in Scotland. The result was very much owing to the Minute of his right hon. predecessor in Office (Mr. Corry) being in operation in England and not in Scotland, and he was glad of this opportunity to correct a mistake he made on a previous occasion in not giving so much credit as he intended to the action of that Minute. The proposition contained in the Schedule of the Bill would practically give to Scotland what was given to England. Another thing which caused increased expense was that it was deemed inconsistent with the principle of a rate that Article 4 of the Revised Code, relating to aid given to any child engaged in manual labour, should be insisted on. He did not think, however, that that would make much practical difference. The only other point on which there could be more expense had reference to special grants to special districts. He would not go into a detail of the reasons for the special grants, but would content himself with remarking that it would be quite vain to hope to extend education to the Hebrides and to remote districts in the Highlands without the aid of these grants. As far as he was able to make out, the amount which the Treasury might be called on to supply for this increase in the annual grants would be from £6,000 to £7,000, and he should be putting it down at the very utmost if he said £10,000. There was a small item under the head of building grants, but it must be remembered that the total of the building grants in the Hebrides from 1844 to 1864 had amounted only to £1,753. The only other point he had to notice was the provision to re-place the present mode of examination by examiners appointed by the University. He stated yesterday that there would be no loss on that head, and, in fact, he believed that there would be a considerable saving. His right hon. Friend thought it safe to put down the expense of this examination at £600; but as there would be a large number of young men to be examined under the present Bill, two or three additional Inspectors would be required if they were to trust only to the present system of inspection; and the cost of an Inspector's remuneration for the first year of service might be reckoned at £600. Independently, however, of the economical advantages of having the examination conducted by the University, it was not desirable for the central department to have a great amount of detailed work.

Mr. CRAUFURD said, he had to move an Amendment, to insert after "parish" the words "or in any burgh." He thought there might be cases of burghs in which the 3*d.* rate would not give 16*s.* per head, and the object of his Amendment was to enable burghs in that position to have their 3*d.* rate supplemented out of the grants of the Privy Council in the same way as was proposed in respect to landward parishes.

Mr. HENLEY said, as he had read the Bill, whatever money was raised by rate must be met with an equal amount by the Treasury.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was afraid it would be impossible for the Government to accede to the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for Ayr, that the burghs should be put in the same position as landward parishes. The ground for the exception made in the case of landward parishes was the peculiar circumstances of these parishes, and not merely the comparative poverty of the district — though that was a strong reason. Generally speaking, the population was so sparse that even with the same amount of property per head it was more difficult to found a school. Taking these two things into consideration, the Government had thought it right to give this exceptional favour to these special districts. But it would be impossible for the Government to make that a ground for increasing the rate throughout the country.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, there was a general impression that the 16*s.* which was given in the Highland districts was a very large amount as compared with what would be won in England by a child under the most favourable circumstances. But this was not the case. Under the Revised Code at present 15*s.* might be won, whereas, in these exceptional Highland districts, where there was a great difficulty of obtaining education, 16*s*. was the utmost, and the amount would be quite inappreciable as a charge upon the Exchequer. They had taken advantage of all denominational efforts in Scotland, and all the denominational schools would continue under the Bill as at present. In the burghs, where they were rich, a large amount of denominational zeal was in operation, and a considerable number of schools had been formed. The 3*d*. rate was in addition to all that, and in all probability would be quite sufficient. It would certainly be ample when they considered that the 66th clause applied to those large burghs where there were numbers of Roman Catholics and Episcopalians who did not go to the general schools. Those burghs were amply provided with denominational schools by the 66th clause, and under those circumstances he did not see any ground for the exception. The denominational schools were only of use where there was a rich population to support them.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he thought the hon. Gentleman had misunderstood the points he had wished to make. He feared that the bonus of Government would tend to withdraw subscriptions, and to throw so many of these schools on the public rates that the system would break down. He therefore put it distinctly to the Government as to the possibility of making a distinction between town and country. It was important that in working this Bill out Government should not destroy this voluntary agency.

MR. MACFIE said, the Bill permitted denominationalism, but did not require it; and he did not think it even encouraged it. As to the comparative smallness of the amount with which the burghs were to be remunerated, he had no fear of that, for the reason that it would encourage the burghs to unite their schools, and they would thus get rid of the last vestiges of denominationalism.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. CAMERON moved the insertion of the words "or when the same has not been levied, but would if levied yield." That would enable grants to be made in those parishes where the 3*d*. rate had not been levied.

MR. W. E. FORSTER opposed the Amendment, which, if adopted, would do away with the provision of the Schedule altogether.

Amendment *negatived.*

LORD ELCHO moved to leave out the words "beyond the sum fixed by," in order to insert "under" in line 37 of the Schedule, the effect of the Amendment being to make all sums derived from the legal assessment of the heritors of any parish under the minimum sum fixed by the Parochial and Burghs Schoolmasters' Scotland Act, 1861, available as local contribution for the purpose of the Act. In 1863, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was then Vice President of the Council, expressed an opinion to the effect that the amount which the heritors were bound to pay could not be considered in the light of an endowment, but was more in the nature of a charitable contribution. But as the Bill stood, a new and unfair principle had been introduced, the Privy Council giving nothing to any parochial schools which had local contributions up to £35, and giving grants to the other schools whether they raised £1, £35, or £100.

Amendment proposed, in Schedule (A), page 28, lines 37 and 38, to leave out the words "beyond the minimum sum fixed by," in order to insert the word "under," — (*Lord Elcho,*) — instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the Government must object to the Amendment, because it would lead to a new demand upon the Imperial purse, and it would alter all the arrangements with regard to the conditions on which aid should be given in Scotland. It would be unreasonable to do that at the last moment—especially as the question had been very carefully considered as to what change should be made, and in what respects more money should be given. There was another ground on which he objected to the Amendment, and that was, that no interference whatever had been made with the mode in which parochial schools were paid for; and he did not think it would be wise now to make any change with regard to it. As to the schoolmasters, he was glad to find, whatever might be said against the old parochial schools system of Scotland, that the result of the system had been to produce, upon the whole, a better paid body of schoolmasters than in any other part of the three Kingdoms. The Schedule was the result of an arrangement which was considered satisfactory by those who took an interest in the matter. He thought the question was one that ought to be considered by the Government, but he could not mislead the House by holding out the hope that an arrangement which had been carefully considered would be annulled.

Lord ELCHO said, he would withdraw the proposition for the present; but he gave notice that he would bring it forward on the third reading, as everyone who had spoken upon it had thought it an equitable proposition.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY *moved* the insertion of the following words, after the word "Scotland" in line 17 of the Preamble "including religious education according to use and wont."

Amendment proposed, in the Preamble, page 1, line 17, after the word "Scotland," to insert the words "including religious education according to use and wont."—(*Sir Graham Montgomery.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. HENLEY remarked that the Bill in its present state reminded him of what Sir Robert Inglis had said of an Irish Education Bill—namely, that it was "a gigantic scheme of godless education." He believed that religion was only twice referred to in the Bill, and then only in a negative form, once in a clause which said that the Inspector should not make inquiry into religious matters, and again in the Conscience Clause. These were the only two places in which there was any allusion to the existence of such a thing as religion or religious feeling, and he thought it unfortunate that it should be so.

Mr. GRAHAM said, there was a large number of persons in Scotland—he was one of them — who objected to any legislation which would make the teaching of religion compulsory. The religious element in Scotch education must be a matter of conviction and not of compulsion.

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR: I hope that the hon. Member for Peebles and Selkirk will not press his Amendment. I agree with him, and with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire, that the Scotch people have no desire for mere secular education in their schools. From the time that the Church of Scotland became the successor of Papacy and Episcopacy, as a Church of the State, she has been ardent in the cause of education, and has infused into it religious teaching. This was so thoroughly understood that there is nothing provided to that effect in the Act of 1696, when the management of the schools passed over from the Church to the lay heritors. The Church will not forget her old traditions now, though the area of taxation is enlarged and rate-payers are substituted for heritors. The Free Church, which, since its formation in 1843, has spent £600,000 on schools, is not likely to be less zealous in the cause of religion, although, confiding in a national system, she may no longer continue to create new schools. The large body of United Presbyterians have always taken a distinctive and enlightened view of the duties of a Church in the religious education of the people. The great bulk of the Scottish people have one Bible, one Catechism, one Confession of Faith. It is no doubt the earnest desire of the Scottish people to use these in what their old divines called "the godly upbringing of their youth." All the Churches will join in this pious act with fervid zeal, provided you entrust to them the duties of a common Christianity which they all profess, and do not raise up denominational jealousies to keep them asunder. I object to the insertion of these words, not because they introduce religion into Scotch schools, for that is desired by the people, but because they are unnecessary, and tend to perpetuate sectarian bitterness, which it is the object of this measure to allay. The "use and wont" for which the hon. Members contend is objected to on very different grounds by three Churches in Scotland. The United Presbyterians object to it on the principle that the Church and the parents should deal with religion, and the school with secular education. Episcopalians dislike it, because "use and wont" mean the Catechism of the Church of Scotland and the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Roman Catholics cannot consent to it, for the tenets of the Presbyterian Church are essentially different from their own. The terms "use and wont" introduced into the Bill necessarily limit its nationality, and restrict its application. Besides, no security for the future religious character of a nation can be given by the insertion of a few words in an Act of Parliament. A far more lasting security subsists in the past and present religious character of the people. Scotland rested on that security, when, in 1696, it established the national system, without any statutory provisions of a religious kind. Let us rest on it now in the assured conviction that the religion, morality, and knowledge of the community will be best promoted by the confidence which we repose in the religious sense of the people.

MR. M'LAREN wished to say a word in reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh. The hon. Gentleman had stated in substance that the Church of Scotland always took care of the religious teaching of the schools. This was an error. The Act of George III. which regulated the schools provided that the heritors should decide upon those branches of education which were to be taught; and, having done this, they were to appoint the teacher, and send him to the presbytery to be examined respecting his ability to teach these branches; but beyond this the Church had nothing to do with the matter. The feeling of the people was that religion should be taught, and, as far as he knew, very few persons objected to this; but very many would object to anything like a provision to compel that to be done which had always been done by tacit assent. With regard to what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire as to there being nothing in the Bill about religion, and as to its being "a gigantic scheme of godless education," he could only say that it was the same scheme that had existed for centuries in Scotland, and he had never before heard it termed a scheme of godless education. On the contrary, this Bill did more than any Act that had ever been passed to recognize religion, because it said there should be a Conscience Clause. Now, did not this imply that religion was expected to be taught; otherwise, why should a Conscience Clause be needed? Another provision in the Bill said that the Inspector should not inquire respecting the religious teaching. Did not this also imply that there was to be religious teaching? If not, why should they prohibit the Inspector from inquiring into it? Therefore, in place of the Bill being one for reducing the system of education in Scotland to what the right hon. Gentleman called a godless system, he held that there was a stronger recognition of religious teaching in the Bill than in any of the Acts which had yet been passed respecting parish schools in Scotland.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, he was of opinion that it was the duty of the Legislature to provide for the religious education of the people, but he concurred with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh in thinking that in this Bill the Legislature had provided for the religious education of the people by placing the responsibility in such hands as would secure a good religious education. He hoped, therefore, that this would not be called a godless Bill. The particular question was whether they should put a recognition of religious teaching in the front of the Bill by inserting the words suggested in the Preamble of the Bill. As a matter of choice he would prefer that it should be so; but if the Amendment were pressed to a division, he should vote for it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read the third time upon Monday."

MR. C. DALRYMPLE moved that the Bill be re-committed, in order to raise the question as to the appointment of the Secretary to the Board. Whether the Bill was a godless Bill or not, it was boasted to be an undenominational Bill. What was proposed to be done was to stamp it as a Bill of an unsectarian character. Now, he desired to see this principle carried out in the appointment of the Secretary to the Board; indeed, he would go still further, and say that, in his opinion, not only ought the Secretary to be a layman, but the members of the Board ought to be laymen also. He would not, however, propose this now. He hoped the Government would see that it would not be fitting to propose any minister of religion as Secretary, and he trusted also that if any minister of religion was placed upon the Board, he would be selected only on the ground of his services to the cause of education, and that he would not be associated in the minds of the people with distinct sectarian opinions.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House,"—(*Mr. Charles Dalrymple,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER thought it would be in the highest degree unwise to appoint a clerical Secretary. In saying this he did not in the faintest degree imply a slur on any minister. It was simply urged in deference to the fact that, unfortunately, Scotland was broken into sects and parties of Churchmen, and to appoint any clergyman, however distinguished, would, he thought, be very unwise.

MR. STAPLETON said, he could not part with the Bill without expressing a hope that this was the last time important social questions affecting Scotland would be settled by a Scotch Parliament, sitting in a committee room upstairs. When he first came into the House, then a long time ago, he was told that this was done to save time. It did not save time now. There had been no Bill before the House that Session—whether from England or from Ireland—on which more time had been wasted than on that Bill. Though the Bill had never been properly discussed on its principles, the time of the House had been wasted in unprofitable wrangles on almost every occasion on which the Bill had to make a step in its progress through that House. There were questions coming on in Scotland of great social importance. The question of hypothec—by which the rights of landlord and tenant not only in this Empire, but through all Europe might be affected—those of the Game Laws and the Poor Laws; and, lastly, that of education itself, which was sure to be raised again, were all of the deepest social importance. They could not be settled by Scotchmen for Scotland alone. The whole Empire would be affected by what happened in Scotland. He, for one, would not consent that, whilst a social revolution was brewing in Scotland, English Members should sit still, without taking any part in the discussion, without attempting to check or to control it, until it overflowed the Border and they were submerged.

COLONEL SYKES said, he could not concur in several portions of the Bill, particularly that portion which related to the establishment of the Board. He objected to the Board on the grounds that it would increase patronage, that it would increase expense, and diminish efficiency. If the Vice President of the Council of Education could manage a Department relating to a population several times more numerous than that of Scotland, he thought a single Commissioner would be sufficient for Scotland. With regard to the question whether the Secretary should or should not be a clergyman, he thought the Government would exercise a sound discretion in the matter, and that to prescribe a certain line for the Government to follow would not only be invidious, but very unwise.

MR. BOUVERIE protested against Members of the House taking possession of the appointment of Secretary, and saying who was or was not to be appointed. The Bill proposed to place the responsibility of the selection upon the Government. If the House thought the Government unfit to be entrusted with this responsibility, they were also unfit to sit on the Treasury Bench.

MR. CRAUFURD said, he thought it was not too much to ask the Government for a pledge that the Secretary should be a layman.

MR. BRUCE said, that the Government had listened with great respect to all the suggestions that had been made, both in public and private, with regard to the appointment of Secretary to the Board; but in their opinion they would not be justified in pledging themselves to exclude any class of persons from a title to the appointment. At the same time, they would give the most careful consideration to any suggestion that might be made; and of course they were most anxious to make such an appointment as would be likely to command general support. The hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) had said that if the Vice President of the Committee of Council could administer the Office intrusted to him, why could they not trust one man in the case of Scotland. He (Mr. Bruce) would not say that one man could not do it, but there were other considerations to be regarded. It was essential that the Board should be a representative body, and that persons representing various opinions should be upon it. He could not sit down without thanking the House for the patience with which they had conducted the protracted discussion on this Bill, and he must give his tribute to the perfect fairness with which the hon. Gentlemen opposite had conducted those discussions under circumstances which he quite admitted were open to expostulation. He hoped on Monday to be able to state the names of the Commissioners and of the Secretary.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, that if it was proper that the Secretary should be a clergyman, the members of the Board should be clergymen also. There was no doubt that the Government would see that the Board should be so constituted as to be an impartial one. There were many clerically-minded persons among the laity, and the question was not so much one of the profession of those who might be appointed as of the liberality of their views.

LORD ELCHO said, he had yesterday mentioned that there was a rumour afloat, that a certain minister in Scotland who had taken a very active part for the Government in the elections had been promised the appointment of Secretary. The right hon. Member for Kilmarnock had taken to task those who endeavoured to get the Government to give a pledge on this subject. He (Lord Elcho) agreed with his hon. Friend near him, that, in the case of a Bill the object of which to be undenominational, one of the worst things that they could do would be to give a denominational character to the measure by appointing a clerical gentlemen to the office of Secretary. The majority on that (the Opposition) side of the House were perfectly agreed that the office should not be filled by a clergyman.

THE LORD ADVOCATE thought it a pity that the noble Lord should have mingled with a question, what it was quite fair to consider, observations or allusions to an individual. The Government would endeavour to make appointments which would fairly represent the feelings of the people of Scotland, and they would not be led into a discussion upon an individual question which his noble Friend had, he thought, with questionable taste, introduced.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill to be read the third time upon *Monday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 265.]

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (No. 2) (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 154.]—COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Secretary Bruce.*)

Order for Committee read.

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in moving that the Order for the House to resolve into Committee on this Bill be discharged, stated that it was a Bill to provide for the examination and registry of teachers in endowed schools and others, and for the examination of scholars, and it had formed part of a Bill which he brought in at an early period of the Session, and a great portion of which had become law. It was thought advisable by the Select Committee to which the measure as originally introduced was referred that it should be divided into two parts, the first to consist of a plan for the reform and organization of endowed schools, and the second of a scheme to provide for the examination of scholars and the certificating and registering of teachers. He found that there was a general expression of opinion in the House in favour of the principle of the Bill, though some doubts were entertained as to the mode in which it should be carried out. In consequence, it had been suggested that it would be advisable to allow the Bill to be circulated through the country, especially as it was hopeless in the present state of Public Business to endeavour to pass it into law in the present year; and he trusted that it would during the Recess receive consideration from all parties interested in the matter. The Bill would establish a council independent of the Government, and the duty of that council would be to provide for the examination of the teachers and scholars of endowed schools, and for the registration of the teachers, as well as to offer to private schools the same opportunities for examination and to give to the teachers in them the same means of obtaining certificates of competence. It was thought by the Government that the measure passed for the reform of endowed schools would not be sufficient to secure by itself the good working of the schools for the future, and that there ought to be some means by which the standard of teaching could be kept up. It was also a great point to determine, though it was not for the Government to decide the matter, what should be that standard; and, therefore, a council most likely to have the confidence of the scholastic profession, being partly composed of members of the Universities, and partly of members nominated by the Crown, including persons having experience in teaching, was devised. In proposing this council one great object was that it should have the confidence not only of the masters of endowed schools and of the parents of the children educated therein, but also the confidence of the masters of private schools, on whom reliance must to a great extent be placed for the spread of secondary education. He thought that the public, after considering the Bill, would feel that some measure of this kind would tend to raise the profession of teaching throughout the country, and give a security to parents that they would obtain good instruction for their children in exchange for their money. The measure had been hailed with pleasure by many of the best masters both of private and public schools as a means of enabling the profession to acquire and maintain its proper position in this country.

Mr. ACLAND said, that the course proposed to be taken by the right hon. Gentleman would give satisfaction to the country. He wished to know whether the Bill was intended to apply to public schools not regulated by the Act recently passed as well as to endowed schools?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER replied that the seven great schools for which the House legislated last year were excluded from the Bill as originally introduced in the present year, it being felt that, inasmuch as they were re-organized last year, they could not be included in the reform of this year; but there were really no reasons why they should not be subjected to the same conditions as to examinations as the other endowed schools, and, though there might have been some advantages in legislating last year for those schools by themselves, there was a disadvantage in creating a distinction between them and other endowed schools. There was no reason to suppose that the examinations, if good for one set, would not be good for the other set, and, therefore, the measure which he proposed to circulate through the country applied just as much to the schools legislated for last year as to those which were regulated in the present year.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock, till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 9th August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading—Committee Negatived* — Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) * (279); Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation * (294); Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan * (285).

Committee — Report — Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) * (280).

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c.* (272); Dividends on Public Stocks * (269); Harbour of Galle Loan * (268); Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment * (266); East India Loan * (267); Inclosure of Lands * (270); Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * (273); Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment * (271); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment * (227). and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 76]; Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 59]; Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 58]; Imprisonment for Debt [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 62]; Civil Offices (Pensions) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 60]; Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 61]; Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 63]; Valuation of Property (Metropolis) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 67]; Evidence Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 68]; Jamaica Loans [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 69]; Contagious Diseases (Animals) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 70]; Bankruptcy [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 71]; Land Tax Commissioners Names [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 64]; Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 83]; Telegraphs [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 73]; Public Works (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 74]; Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 75]; Basses Lights, Ceylon, [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 77]; Criminal Lunatics [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 78]; Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 79]; Militia Pay [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 66]; Militia (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 80]; Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 81]; Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 82]; Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham)

[32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 84]; Expiring Laws Continuance [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 85]; Accounts, &c. Presentation [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 86]; Prevention of Gaming (Scotland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 87]; Straits Settlements [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 88]; Clerks of Assize [32 & 33 *Vict* c. 89]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 72]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 90]; Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 91]; Dublin Freemen Commission [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 65]; Fisheries (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 92]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. cxxiv.]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. cxlix.]

BISHOPS RESIGNATION BILL—(No. 201.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in the absence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, moved that the Amendments made by the Commons in this Bill be *agreed to.* The principal alterations made by the other House were, that they had struck out the reference to "bodily infirmity," which was inserted in the Bill on the Motion of the Duke of Somerset, and had limited the operation of the Bill to two years and to the end of the then next Session; a further Amendment, however, would be necessary, which he would now propose, providing that arrangements made during that period should continue to be valid.

Commons' Amendments *agreed to*, with an Amendment; and Bill, with the Amendments, returned to the Commons.

HABITUAL CRIMINALS BILL—(No. 41.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order).

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY moved to agree to the Amendments made by the Commons in this Bill. He believed they were on the whole improvements, and would not interfere with the general principle of the measure. The Bill, as amended, provided that the Act should extend to Scotland and Ireland; that the conditions on which tickets of leave were granted should be laid before Parliament; that the registration should apply to all classes of criminals included in the Bill; that the supervision should be limited to convictions on indictments, and that it should be at the discretion of the Judge who passed the sentence whether that supervision should in all cases be imposed. The clause subjecting persons thrice convicted of certain offences to supervision for life had been struck out, it being felt that this would exclude them from all hope of returning to honest courses, and such supervision was therefore to be limited, as in other cases, to seven years. The clause making it obligatory on Judges to pass a sentence of seven years' penal servitude for the third offence had also been struck out, it being desirable that Judges should have a discretionary power. The clause regarding receivers of stolen goods had likewise been modified A Schedule had been inserted defining the offences in Scotland to which the Bill was to apply. He believed the Bill as now settled would prove a useful addition to our legislation on this subject.

Commons' Amendments *agreed to.*

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(NO. 119.) COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Bill, returned from the Commons, *agreed to*, with Amendments.

Moved, That the Commons' Amendments be considered To-Morrow.—(*The Duke of Argyll.*)

LORD REDESDALE said, he should like to ask the noble Earl (the Secretary for the Colonies) if the Government really intended to seriously propose going on with the Bill at this late period of the Session? He intended to move that they do not go on with it; but he would rather let the Government have the opportunity of voluntarily withdrawing it than that they should be compelled to do so by an adverse vote. The noble Earl must himself be conscious that after the Appropriation Bill had been passed, it was not fair to ask their Lordships to proceed with a Bill which involved such controversy as this did. It was the duty of the Government to afford their Lordships a full and fair opportunity to reconsider the Bill when it came back again from the Commons, and he (Lord Redesdale) said they could not do anything of the kind, now that they were within a couple of days of the close of the Session. He trusted it would not be necessary for him to move the Motion of which he had given notice.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he stated on Saturday that it was the intention of Government to propose to proceed with the Bill to-morrow, and he was glad to see such a large attendance of their Lordships on this occasion. He knew that some of their Lordships entirely objected to this measure; but there were other Members of the House who thought it a measure of very great importance; and therefore the Government thought it their duty to ask their Lordships to go on with the Bill, in order that it might become law this Session.

Viscount MELVILLE asked how it was possible to consider such a Bill as this two days before the end of the Session? He moreover understood the Bill to which the House of Commons had agreed was one entirely different from that which was sent down to them by their Lordships, and therefore the Bill must necessarily give rise to considerable discussion. Under these circumstances it would be a most unjustifiable course if the Government persisted in forcing the Bill forward. All the other important business of the Session had been disposed of, and many of the Members of the House had left town, and it would be a most culpable thing for the Government to ask the House to discuss the Bill on its merits or demerits, when it was simply impossible to consider the Amendments made by the other House.

Lord REDESDALE said, that the answer given by the noble Earl (Earl Granville) only left one course consistent with the duty which he owed to himself and to their Lordships, and that was to move as an Amendment to the Motion of the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), that the Amendments made by the Commons in the Bill be taken into consideration this day three months. He should like to know what were supposed to be the duties of their Lordships with regard to Public Business, and how they ought to act in regard to important measures such as this? This was a Bill of sixty clauses, and there would be a great many Amendments to the clauses if the Bill were proceeded with. He wanted to ask how they were properly to consider all this when the Session was virtually over? Besides, would it be fair for the Government to propose certain clauses now which they knew very well if they had submitted them to their Lordships six weeks ago they would have had no chance of acceptance? The Bill, which had been read a third time that day and passed in the Commons, would not be delivered to their Lordships until to-morrow; and it was promised that Parliament should be prorogued on Wednesday, or, at latest, on Thursday. How would it be possible, when they only got the Bill back on Tuesday, to carefully consider it before Wednesday or Thursday? How would it be possible for one Peer to communicate with another as to what Amendments it might be desirable to accept and what ought to be rejected? There would be no opportunity whatever. There would be no time for communication with parties in Scotland, and no time to do anything but to accept just what Government proposed without inquiry and without deliberation. He submitted it would not be right for their Lordships to yield to Government in this matter. Let the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) make ever so clear a statement to-morrow of the character of the Amendments which had been made in the other House, their Lordships would still require time to consider for themselves what the effect of these Amendments might be. He said that if their Lordships should proceed in such a manner as that proposed by Government with regard to public legislation, there was an end to the dignity and reputation of their Lordships' House, and they would, in fact, become merely the register of anything which came from the other House. Now, he did not think the other House had any reason to be hard upon them if they declined to take the Bill further into their consideration this Session; because they themselves had hardly shown that alacrity to deal with the subject which some might have supposed they would have done. The measure was sent down to them on the 14th of June, and was fixed for second reading on the 21st of that month, but it was then deferred till the 28th, next to the 5th of July, and again to the 12th, when it was read a second time, so that there was no less than a month consumed in postponements. It was ordered for committal the next day, but this turned out to be only a committal *pro formâ* for the purpose of altering the entire character of the Bill and restoring it very much to its shape when originally introduced by the Government into this House.

Thus the Commons never had the Bill sent down by their Lordships fairly submitted to them — a proceeding against which their Lordships had a right to protest. After having been committed *pro formâ*, the Committee was more than once postponed, and it was not till the 27th of July that the Commons began to consider its clauses, the proceedings being then adjourned to the 2nd of August. The Appropriation Bill had passed the House, and they were told that they were within two days of the close of the Session, yet the Government press on us to re-open the discussion on such an important measure as this. He said that if their Lordships agreed to such a proposition it would be a mere mockery of legislation. Noble Lords opposite might like to know the opinion of the Prime Minister on proceeding with important Bills at the very close of the Session. On the 23rd of July, 1856, a Bill relating to the resignation of the Bishops of London and Durham having been sent down to the Commons, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The business of the country has been almost entirely wound up. We have passed the Appropriation Bill—that which we look upon as the natural termination of the important business of the Session; our functions in Committee of Supply have ended. It is not merely the date of the 23rd of July which we have to consider, though I must say that if Government continue the practice of introducing these most difficult Bills, these measures of such vast importance, when the Session is expiring, it will be necessary for this House, in self-defence, to resort to a measure which has been adopted in the other House, and to pass rules fixing positive dates, after which they will not consent to entertain such measures. . . . We have, in fact, come to a state of things in which some forty or forty-five persons holding office under the Government virtually decide every question before the House."—[3 *Hansard*, cxliii. 1327.]

The practice of proceeding with important measures at a period when the larger number of the Members of the House had conceived that their duties were over, and that they might retire to the country, was a practice that required to be checked if the House wished to preserve its privileges. A short time since it was understood that to-morrow was to be the date of the prorogation, and accordingly many noble Lords left town, in the belief that the business of the Session had virtually been concluded. It was not till last week that the date was extended to Wednesday or Thursday; and if Thursday was the day there would be no time for communication with the House of Commons, to arrange which of the Amendments might be accepted. Their Lordships were aware that he had always attended to this matter not at all as a party question, but with the view of watching the privileges of the House and securing fair deliberation. At one time, indeed, he induced their Lordships to take the course referred to by Mr. Gladstone in the speech he had quoted—namely, to resolve that after a certain day no Bill should be read a second time; and though in deference to a feeling of jealousy on the part of the Commons he gave up pressing for that Order, he did so on the understanding that the principle of it would be adhered to by the Governments of the day.

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("To-morrow") and insert ("this day three months.")—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)

The Duke of ARGYLL: My Lords, before I refer to the early part of my noble Friend's speech, I must remark that it is unquestionably a fact that there are two or three Members of this House who have from the very beginning been hostile to the principle of this Bill. They have opposed it on all occasions, and they have expressed extreme regret that the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) supported it on the second reading. In Committee they supported every Amendment for altering the principle of the Bill, or which was damaging to it. Some of these noble Lords may be now present; and I do not at all complain of the course which they will probably take in supporting the Amendment of my noble Friend (Lord Redesdale). It is perfectly legitimate for them, entertaining as they do a conscientious objection to the principle of the Bill, to take advantage of any technical means of securing their object. But I would appeal to a great number of Lords opposite, who had no objection to the third reading, and who thought it, on the whole, a valuable Bill—I would earnestly appeal to them to hear what I have to say in regard to the point of Order, and to the question whether your Lordships ought or ought not to proceed to the consideration of the Amendments made by the Commons—for I beg your Lordships to observe that the Amendment of my noble Friend is that you should not even consider the Amendments made by the Commons. My noble Friend said that these Amendments entirely alter the structure and character of the Bill. Now, I venture to affirm the contrary. I venture to say that those Amendments do not alter the structure and character of the Bill. But, before I enter into the question, I must be allowed to refer to another point—one connected with our procedure. The Amendment now before the House professes to be founded solely on a question of procedure, and, therefore, before I say anything with regard to the Amendments, I wish to direct attention to that point. Ever since I became a Member of this House I have had a great desire to maintain its authority. When I was an independent Member unconnected with the Government I often felt the justice of the complaint that important business was put off to a very late period of the Session, and I well remember the late Lord Aberdeen saying, in answer to a question, that though he had been upwards of fifty years in the House, he could remember no time when that complaint was not made. It appears to me in the nature of things, considering the relative position of the two Houses, that important business should come up at a late period of the Session. What is one of the causes of that? Why, it is that the House of Lords has been becoming less and less a House for the initiation of legislation. Measures of an important kind are generally brought into the House of Commons, and every Ministry has felt the advantage of having the support of a majority of the House of Commons in bringing a measure before your Lordships. Therefore it is that this House has been becoming less and less a House in which important measures are initiated. Now, I beg to remind your Lordships that so far from the Government having been unmindful of the position of this House, or indifferent to maintaining its influence in legislation, they took the unusual course of introducing this Bill in your Lordships' House, and desired that it should be considered by your Lordships in the first instance. That course was especially unusual considering the character of this Bill, because it is, to a very large extent, a Bill involving the question of rates. Rating is not merely an incident of the Bill, but it is an essential part of it. I say, then, that the Government gave every possible proof of their desire that the opinion of this House should be consulted in due time in this question of education in Scotland. Let me remind your Lordships that it was at the request of the noble Lords opposite, as well as of some noble Lords near me, that I consented more than once to a postponement of legislation that made the discussion on the Bill take place considerably later than it would otherwise have been the case. One cause of delay was the natural desire to consult the Commissioners of Supply in Scotland. I have the greatest possible respect for the Commissioners, but I say that this question of education is now ripe for legislation, that Parliament ought to legislate on its own authority, and that it was inexpedient for the Members of the other House to consult local bodies of that kind, or for this House to postpone legislation with a view of obtaining their opinions. On two occasions I have, in deference to the opinion of noble Lords opposite, postponed the measure to a dangerously late period of the Session—dangerously late, considering the occupation of the time of the House of Commons, and the great importance of the measures with which they were occupied. My Lords, there has never been a Session when the time of the House has been more occupied or engrossed with more important measures. I have great respect for the opinion of my noble Friend (Lord Redesdale). I believe no man is more anxious than he is to maintain the reputation and authority of this House, and I know his thorough honesty of purpose; but I would venture to ask him, as well as your Lordships generally, whether it can be conducive to the honour and reputation of this House that, when a measure of this kind, initiated in this House, has been sent down to the House of Commons and amended by them, your Lordships should refuse even to consider the Amendments which have been made. I must say that that appears to me almost a monstrous course. As regards the lateness of the Session, the lateness is the same to the House of Commons as to the House of Lords. The time of the House of Commons has been more engrossed than that of your Lordships, and the labour of the Members of that House been infinitely more severe. I really believe that for every ten hours that we have sat in this House something like forty or fifty have been occupied by the labours of the House of Commons. I ask is it for the reputation of this House, is it for the honour of this House, that we should say to the House of Commons, who were ready to consider our Amendments up to the second week in August—"We are unwilling now to consider Amendments you have made in a measure initiated by us?" I think that under the peculiar circumstances of the case the argument of my noble Friend will not hold for a single moment with regard to the lateness of the period in the House of Commons. I repeatedly urged upon my Colleagues the importance of this Bill being taken into consideration by the other House at an earlier period, and it was nothing but the urgency and importance of Public Business which prevented that from being done. The Members of the House of Commons have not thought it too late to consider your Lordships' Amendments, which were large and important. Those Amendments were considered even up to the end of last week, and I cannot help expressing on the present occasion, on behalf of the Government, our earnest gratitude to the Members of the House of Commons, and especially to those connected with Scotland, for the patriotic course which they have pursued with regard to this Bill. They have felt quite as much as your Lordships have done the unfortunate circumstances of this Bill having been so long postponed, but they have, nevertheless, proceeded to consider it with the greatest possible deliberation; and it is within my personal knowledge that many of the Members sacrificed, to a large extent, their individual opinions on points of detail in order to meet the views of Government and of all parties in Scotland, so as to secure the passing of a measure which would be for the advantage of the country. I say, then, that it will not be for the honour or credit of this House, but far from it, if, in the case of a measure initiated in this House, altered largely and re-considered by the House of Commons during last week, we should refuse to take Amendments into consideration, even though it be almost the last day of the Session. And now with regard to the assertion of my noble Friend (Lord Redesdale). I do not blame him, because he knows nothing about the question of education in Scotland, and probably cares less—but I say he is wholly mistaken with regard to the character of the Amendments made in this Bill. Let me recall to the recollection of the House a few questions. Very great stress was made by noble Lords opposite—indeed, what appeared to me undue stress—upon the constitution of the Central Board. The Bill returns to this House in that respect precisely in the form in which it was amended by those noble Lords. Noble Lords opposite insisted that that Board should be a small body—a wholly paid body—and that the payment should be sufficient to secure the attendance of the members. On that great question, which was made a testing question, Amendments of this House had been accepted by the Commons. Again, as the Bill was introduced, denominational grants were absolutely prohibited. That feature of the Bill was opposed in this House on behalf of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and also on behalf of Roman Catholics. I myself was always in favour of a compromise on that point, and the House of Commons have adopted a compromise — they have given up the absolute prohibition of denominational grants, and have consented to grants being made under special circumstances. I say that on these great questions the Amendments made by the House of Commons do not in the slightest degree affect the principle of the Bill, and I say that the Government have a right to call upon the House of Lords at least to consider the Amendments of the House of Commons. I need not go further to show that the Bill as it comes up from the House of Commons is rather in favour of than adverse to the views of noble Lords opposite. Let me take one example. There is no part of this Bill which has been more opposed by the clergy and members of the Established Church, and by those who represent the Established Church, than those clauses which provided for conversion of parish schools. They said—and, I cannot deny, with some reason—"Let us see the effect of the new system on the new ground before you alter the constitution and management of those old schools which have worked so well." As the Bill returns from the House of Commons, it is provided that the parish schools shall remain as they are till Parliament shall have otherwise provided. I say, again, on this great question, which is one of the most important connected with the Bill, the opinion of the House of Commons has been, to an unexpected dgree, in accordance with that of the noble Lords opposite. Under these circumstances, to affirm that the Bill before us is wholly different from that which was sent down to the other House, is a mere excuse for getting rid of the Bill altogether. A noble Lord, who has now left the House, and, I believe, left town, asked me the other day—"What is the great hurry of passing this Bill?" I say there is a great hurry about passing any Bill on education which has arrived at this stage through both Houses of Parliament. We know that the subject has been surrounded with difficulties for many years, and we know that it has been a source of satisfaction to those who are connected with this Bill, and to others, that the question has arrived so near a solution. Next year we shall probably have as full a bill of fare as we have had this year, and it may be complicated by the introduction of the question of education in England and Ireland. I say here, on behalf of Scotland, that we have a right to consideration on our own merits, and with reference to the circumstances of our own country, and we ought not to allow any Bill to be sacrificed in deference to the prejudices of England or the difficulties of Ireland. There is another reason why we ought not to delay the passing of this Bill. The Royal Commission have reported that upwards of 90,000 children are without education in the large towns of Scotland, and we must remember that in every year of unnecessary delay thousands of the young are passing from the hands of those by whom alone they can be redeemed from the ranks of ignorance and vice. I rejoice that Government have determined that they will have no share in the responsibility of another year's delay on this great question. I rejoice that the House of Commons have determined — the Members for Scotland almost with one unanimous voice—that they will have no share in that responsibility, and I adjure your Lordships not to allow it to be said that the House of Lords has taken an obstructive course in regard to legislation on this question.

The Earl of SELKIRK said, that he had given much study to the original Bill, but he now found it so completely altered that it required a new study in order to comprehend the changes which had been made in the other House of Parliament, and he thought it unreasonable that their Lordships should be asked to take this new proposal into consideration at so late a period of the Session.

Lord COLONSAY said, he sympathized with what had just been said by his noble Friend (the Earl of Selkirk). He had not had much experience with regard to the termination of Sessions, otherwise he should perhaps have viewed with some alarm what had taken place with regard to this Bill. During the last ten days the torrent of legislation had been rushing on with almost unprecedented force. The only security they could have for sound legislation—that kind of legislation which the people had a right to expect — was that measures should have deliberate consideration in both Houses of Parliament in their various stages, so that there might be an opportunity of ascertaining that the measure was sound in principle, effective in machinery, and couched in language adapted to the purpose for which it was framed. Now, this measure had not received this sort of consideration. It was brought in on an early day — and he certainly felt indebted to his noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) for the opportunity which he afforded for its being considered in Scotland before it was proceeded with in this House. He did not agree with him in thinking that this had anything to do with the delay, because the House of Commons had, according to his own showing, been so engaged with a very important measure that it would not possibly have proceeded with this Bill. The Bill, however, was sent down to the other House, where its progress was long deferred; and when it did come back to their Lordships' House it came back so different from its former self, so altered in shape, so changed in countenance, that he ventured to think that those whose names were placed at the back of it could scarcely recognize it as the Bill they sent forth. Their Lordships were now called on at the very last moment to consider these Amendments. The Bill having passed through Committee in the other House *pro formâ*, it was taken in hand by the

Lord Advocate, who applied his acute mind to it, and gave to it what was called in Parliamentary language "a respectful consideration." At least twenty clauses were subjected to that kind of operation to the extent of forty Amendments, and the Bill came out of the furnace a very different Bill from what it was when it went in. The Bill sent down from this House never was, in fact, considered by the other House. It underwent a transforming and obliterating process before it was submitted for consideration. He (Lord Colonsay) did not think that course was at all a usual one; on the contrary, he believed it was almost unprecedented in reference to an important measure, and he hoped their Lordships would bear that in mind in dealing with the question now before them. The altered Bill having come to be considered various important changes were made in it. It was true, as the noble Duke had said, that the question of the Central Board was ultimately retained very much in the form in which it was amended in this House; but there were various other important alterations made in the Bill, both in principle and detail. The parochial schools were left under the management of those who at present manage them; but an option was given to bring them under the new constitution which this Bill was to provide. No doubt there was a want of additional schools in some places, and power was given under this Bill to the Board to select places where schools should be planted, and those schools were to be upheld by a new rate that was to be imposed. Those who had the management of the parochial schools had the option of transferring the schools to the new management, and the Bill provided that in case they did so the persons liable for the cost of the parochial schools should be relieved from that expense, and the schools put upon the rates. But as this Bill was now framed those who were at present liable for the burden of the parochial schools were to retain the burden upon themselves, and the maximum rate that was fixed by this Bill as sufficient to defray the expense of both present parochial schools and the schools to be adopted or newly-created, was retained in the Bill, and power was given to a local committee to assess the whole land of Scotland to the full amount of that maximum rate, while the heritors would be still bound to support the existing parochial schools. That was an important alteration; but that was not all. Those who had the management of the parochial schools under an Act passed upwards of sixty years ago, were no longer to have the management of them, and a new and a very large body was to be infused into the management. And who were to be on the local committee? Why, every proprietor of lands or houses in the parish under £4 a year was to have a voice in the selection of a school committee, which school committee was to have the power of assessment. He thought their Lordships would not consider it satisfactory—certainly those who were interested in the cause of education would not think it satisfactory; and he was satisfied still more that those who outside take an interest in the regularity and propriety of legislation would not consider it satisfactory — that they should now be called upon to deal with a measure of this kind.

EARL GRANVILLE said, it had been stated by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Colonsay) that no explanation had been made to the other House with regard to the character of the Amendments made in the Bill by this House. The noble and learned Lord, however, was misinformed upon that point, for a full statement, lasting half-an-hour, was made to the other House by the right hon. and learned Lord who had charge of the Bill. Then it was said that it was unreasonable to give their Lordships only one night in which to consider these Amendments. But the House would remember that, when they went before into Committee on the Bill, although it was then much changed from its original form, they went through the Bill in one evening — exactly the time which their Lordships would now have for considering the Commons' Amendments.

LORD REDESDALE would remind their Lordships that on the occasion referred to by the noble Earl all the Amendments were printed and in the hands of their Lordships many days before they were considered. They had been told by the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) that it would be an ungracious thing for their Lordships having sent a Bill down to the Commons, to refuse to consider the Amendments made by the Commons when the Bill was returned to their Lordships. But it was small encouragement to their Lordships to originate measures if, because those measures had been altered in this House, contrary to the views of the Government who commanded a majority in the other House, the Government were entirely to alter the Bill in the other House and only return it to this House when the attendance was so thin that it was impossible to secure a proper consideration of Amendments. Such a course would be practically making this House merely the obedient servant of the Government of the day in dealing with measures of this kind.

On Question, That ("To-morrow") stand part of the Motion?—Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 43; Not-Contents 55: Majority 12.

CONTENTS.

Hatherley, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Cleveland, D.
Saint Albans, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Normanby, M.

Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Essex, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.

Falmouth, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sydney, V.

Audley, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Carrington, L.
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Crewe, L.
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Keane, L.
Leigh, L.
Lurgan, L.
Methuen, L.
Monck, L. (*V. Monck.*)
Northbrook, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sudeley, L.
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Truro, L.
Wentworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Beaufort, D.
Manchester, D.
Norfolk, D.
Northumberland, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.

Amherst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Denbigh, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Kellie, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lucan, E.
Mansfield, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Romney, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Selkirk, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Westmorland, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.
Hood, V.
Melville, V.

Rochester, Bp.

Abinger, L. [*Teller.*]
Bagot, L.
Blantyre, L.
Churston, L.
Colchester, L.
Colonsay, L.
Denman, L.
Digby, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
O'Neill, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Rivers, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Sheffield, L. (*E. Sheffield.*)
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Tredegar, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative,* and Amendments to be considered *this day three months.*

THE CANNING STATUE.—QUESTION.

LORD STRATHEDEN asked, Whether the Government had come to any determination with regard to restoring the statue of Canning to its original place?

EARL GRANVILLE said, the Government had come to no positive determination, and he regretted that no member of the Canning family was present to state his wishes in the matter. For his own part, he had been brought up with the greatest admiration for Mr. Canning, both as a statesman and a man. He was a personal friend of his (Earl Granville's) father, and for his son, as the House was aware, he entertained the greatest regard. His own opinion was, though he should be sorry to act upon it contrary to the wishes of any member of the Canning family—that the present site was not a disadvantageous one for a public testimonial of the admiration felt for Mr. Canning's memory, and he saw in it some advantages which the former site did not possess.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
'till To-morrow, three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 9th August, 1869.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Caithnessshire, *v.* George Traill, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading*—Merchant Shipping and Navigation [267].

Ordered — First Reading — Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (Scotland) * [266].

Committee — Report — Parochial Schools (Scotland) [265].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Charity Commissioners * [239]; Parochial Schools (Scotland) [265], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Queen Anne's Bounty (Superannuation Allowances) * [243]; Steam Boilers Inspection * [64].

The House met at Three of the clock.

PARLIAMENT—PRIVATE BILLS—STANDING ORDERS.

MR. DODSON said, he had to ask the House to adopt two new Standing Orders in relation to Private Business. The first of these was simply an Order substituted for the 35th section of the Act of last Session for the regulation of railways. It was found inconvenient to have the rules embodied in that clause stereotyped in an Act of Parliament, which could not, like Standing Orders, be dispensed with in any peculiar case; and, therefore, with the concurrence of the noble Chairman of Committees in the other House, an Act had been passed this Session which repealed the 35th section of the Act of last year, on the understanding that, when the Private Bills of this Session had been disposed of, a Standing Order should be proposed to the same effect as the repealed clause. It related to the meetings of incorporated railway companies, and the approval by such meetings of Bills and certificates for conferring additional powers on those companies; and the new Standing Order was substantially the same as the clause, with this modification—that the Standing Order required that a statement of the number of the votes should be deposited at the Private Bill Office, instead of being laid before Parliament or the Board of Trade.

Ordered, That every Bill originating in this House and conferring additional powers on the Promoters thereof, being a Company already constituted by Act of Parliament, shall after the first reading thereof be referred to the Examiners, who shall report as to compliance or non-compliance with the following Order:—

The Bill, subsequently to the deposit of the Petition for the same, shall be submitted to the Proprietors of such Company at a meeting held specially for that purpose.

Such meeting shall be called by advertisement inserted once in each of two consecutive weeks in a morning newspaper published in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, as the case may be, and in a newspaper of the county or counties in which the principal office or offices of the Company is or are situate; and also by a circular addressed to each proprietor at his last known or usual address, and sent by post, or delivered at such address, not less than ten days before the holding of such meeting, enclosing a blank form of proxy, with proper instructions for the use of the same; and the same form of proxy and the same instructions, and none other, shall be sent to every such proprietor, and shall be addressed to each proprietor on the back of the form of proxy; but no such form of proxy shall be stamped before it is sent out, nor shall the funds of the Company be used for the stamping any proxies, nor shall intimation be sent as to any person in whose favour the proxy may be granted, and no other circular or form of proxy relating to such meeting shall be sent to any proprietor from the office of the Company, or by any director or officer of the Company so describing himself.

Such meeting shall be held not earlier than the seventh day after the last insertion of such advertisement, and may be held on the same day as an ordinary general meeting of the Company.

At such meeting the said Bill shall be submitted to the proprietors aforesaid then present, and approved of by proprietors, present in person or by proxy, holding at least three-fourths of the paid-up capital of the Company represented at such meeting, such proprietors being qualified to vote at all ordinary meetings of the Company in right of such capital. The votes of proprietors of any paid-up shares or stock other than debenture stock, not qualified to vote at ordinary meetings, whose interests may be affected by the Bill, if tendered at the meeting shall be recorded separately.

There shall be deposited at the Private Bill Office a statement of the number of votes if a poll was taken, and of the number of votes recorded separately.

Ordered, That the said Order be a Standing Order of this House [to follow Standing Order 70].

Standing Order 70 was read, and *repealed.*

Ordered, That in the case of every Bill brought from the House of Lords in which provisions shall have been inserted in that House, empowering the promoters thereof being a Company already constituted by Act of Parliament to execute, undertake, or contribute towards any work other than that for which it was originally established, or to sell or lease their undertaking, or any part thereof, or to amalgamate the same, or any part thereof, with any other undertaking, or to abandon their undertaking, or any part thereof, or to dissolve the said Company, or in which any such provisions originally contained in the Bill shall have been materially altered in that House, or by which any such powers are conferred on any Company not being the Promoters of the Bill, the Examiner shall report as to compliance or non-compliance with the following Order:—

The Bill, as introduced or proposed to be introduced into this House, shall be submitted to the proprietors of such promoting Company and of any other Company on which such powers are so conferred, at a meeting held specially for that purpose.

Such meeting shall be called by advertisement inserted once in each of two consecutive weeks in a morning newspaper published in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, as the case may be, and in a newspaper of the county or counties in which the principal office or offices of the Company is or are situate; and also by a circular addressed to each proprietor at his last known or usual address, and sent by post, or delivered at such address, not less than ten days before the holding of such meeting, enclosing a blank form of proxy, with proper instructions for the use of the same; and the same form of proxy and the same instructions, and none other, shall be sent to every such proprietor, and shall be addressed to each proprietor on the back of the form of proxy; but no such form of proxy shall be stamped before it is sent out, nor shall the funds of the Company be used for the stamping any proxies, nor shall intimation be sent as to any person in whose favour the proxy may be granted, and no other circular or form of proxy relating to such meeting shall be sent to any proprietor from the office of the Company, or by any director or officer of the Company so describing himself.

Such meeting shall be held not earlier than the seventh day after the last insertion of such advertisement, and may be held on the same day as an ordinary general meeting of the Company.

At such meeting the said Bill shall be submitted to the proprietors aforesaid then present, and approved of by proprietors, present in person or by proxy, holding at least three-fourths of the paid-up capital of the Company represented at such meeting, such proprietors being qualified to vote at all ordinary meetings of the Company in right of such capital. The votes of proprietors of any paid-up shares or stock other than debenture stock, not qualified to vote at ordinary meetings, whose interests may be affected by the Bill, if tendered at the meeting shall be recorded separately.

There shall be deposited at the Private Bill Office a statement of the number of votes if a poll was taken, and of the number of votes recorded separately.

Ordered, That the said Order be a Standing Order of this House [in place of Standing Order 70, repealed].

Standing Order 77 was read and amended, by leaving out in line 4, the word "or," and inserting after "71," the words "or 72."

Ordered, That the said Orders be Standing Orders of this House.—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

APPOINTMENT OF REVISING BARRISTERS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL FRENCH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If there is any foundation for the statement which appeared in the "Morning Star" newspaper on Wednesday the 4th of August last, that the Lord Chief Baron called a meeting of the Revising Barristers for the Home Circuit at Lewes, and informed them that the Judges had agreed that the appointment to their offices should be considered temporary, and that in future a preference should always be shown to the sons and relatives of Judges in selecting individuals for these offices? If this were true it was the extension to England of a practice long pursued in Ireland.

MR. BRUCE: Sir, I am satisfied that my hon. and gallant Friend, in putting this Question, did not believe the statement to be true, and did not think the circumstances alleged in it were in the remotest degree probable; but he wished to give to me, or rather to the learned Judge, an opportunity of denying a statement which tends to reflect discredit on him and upon the whole Bench. The best answer I can give to the question is to read a letter I received from the Lord Chief Baron this morning. It is as follows—

"The statement in a newspaper to which Colonel French's Notice refers must be founded upon some unaccountable mistake, or is a mere fiction. I never informed the Revising Barristers for the Home Circuit, or anybody else, 'that the Judges had agreed that the appointment to their offices should be considered temporary, and that in future a preference should always be shown to the sons and relatives of Judges;' nor have the Judges ever so agreed. These appointments are, as you are aware, made under an Act of Parliament, and the Judges have no power to make them permanent or temporary at their pleasure, or otherwise than merely for the revision next ensuing the date of the appointment. I lately called together at Lewes the gentlemen whom I intended to appoint, in order that they might assist me in arranging the districts in which they were respectively to act, and inform me of the addition to their number which they thought would be required. I have since appointed them according to the statute, ten in number, and for the approaching revision only. One of them is the son of a Judge, another the grandson of a former Lord Chancellor, and the remaining eight are the Revising Barristers of last year, whom I simply re-appointed, and who are, as far as I know, unconnected with the Bench. All are unquestionably competent, and I believe among the ablest and the best who could have been selected. This is all the information I am able to give in relation to the Colonel's question."

NAVY—CORRUPTION IN THE ADMIRALTY DEPARTMENTS.—QUESTION.

LORD ELCHO said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) and at his request, he would beg leave to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, If any further steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government to punish the officers of the Admiralty departments who are officially accused of having been engaged in an extensive system of corruption both at Somerset House and at the Dockyards, with a view to the complete exoneration of those gentlemen upon whom no such imputation rests; if any representations have been made by the officers at Somerset House to the Admiralty on the subject; and, if there will be any objection to lay the Correspondence upon the Table of the House?

MR. CHILDERS: In reply, Sir, to my noble Friend I have to state that the words of his Question do not accurately represent what was said in this House by my hon. Friend the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty. My hon. Friend stated that there had been corruption both at Somerset House and at the dockyards in connection with certain contracts, as there had notoriously been in public companies; that he hoped the country would set its face against these transactions; and that it had been his and his Colleagues' endeavour to detect and punish these practices. But my hon. Friend did not either name or point at individuals whom it was possible to prosecute, and so exonerate others. Answering, then, the second Question first, I may say that a letter was addressed to the Admiralty by some of the clerks in Somerset House on this subject. It was in our power to decline to account outside the House of Commons, and especially to subordinates, for words spoken in Parliament; but we thought that, under the circumstances, it was better to make an exception to the rule, and a reply was given to these gentlemen very much to the effect of the answer which I shall presently make to the first Question, and I believe that it has been satisfactory to them. But, as the words complained of were spoken in Parliament, and as I am giving the explanation in the same place, I think it would be inexpedient to publish the letters. I beg, then, to say, in reply to the first Question, that my hon. Friend and his Colleagues would much regret that anything said by him should be misunderstood, and especially that he should be thought by the House to cast unmerited reflection on any officers of the Department whose honour I—and I am sure he—feel it my duty to protect. But there is no doubt that corruption did for some time exist in connection with naval stores; and the papers found on Mr. Rumbold and Mr. Gambier, and information received before and since, leave it beyond a doubt that the particular offence for which they were punished was not an isolated one. I would further say that it must be evident to everyone that these matters are not easy to detect, as both the giver and the receiver are, or imagine themselves, interested in complete secresy, and there is usually no one else privy to the transaction. But I have no hesitation in adding that the great body of the service, and of the branches especially referred to, even while these transactions were going on, was entirely free from the slightest taint of dishonesty, and that should occasion arise for their assistance in detecting and punishing any case which we may hereafter be able to follow up we should unhesitatingly appeal to them for it. Beyond that I decline to give any promise, and I hope that the House will give us credit for determination to do what is, in our opinion, for the public benefit in this matter, and will trust us as to the best means of carrying out this end.

INDIA—TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION.—QUESTION.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, having regard to the probability of the early establishment of independent direct telegraphic communication between this country and India, by the way of Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, and Aden, it may not be desirable to use for other purposes than the extension of the Persian Gulf line the Submarine Cable now on its way to Bombay in the ships "Calcutta" and "Tweed"; and, if he will state the length of the Cable in question, its cost, and the expense of its transport, all charges for freight, demurrage, or otherwise included?

MR. GRANT DUFF: With reference to my hon. Friend's first Question, I have to say that we do not intend to make any change in the destination of the cable to which he alludes. With reference to his second Question, I have to say that the length of the cable is 520 miles. Its original cost, delivered on board, was £87,067. The insurance of the cable in dock, and fittings for the *Calcutta* and *Tweed*, will cost, it is believed, about £6,000 more. The hire of the two ships to Bombay, including demurrage and all other charges so far as they are at present known, will amount to about £33,000, and there are further undecided claims. Nearly £8,000 out of this £33,000 is the estimated cost for repairing the damage done by the accident to the *Calcutta*, which, as my hon. Friend knows, was all but lost in the Channel, with a large part of the cable on board. After arrival at Bombay the *Calcutta* and *Tweed* will cost respectively 15*s*. and 20*s*. per ton per month during the operation of laying the cable.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—CONVEYANCE OF CATTLE.

QUESTION.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Sir Robert Anstruther), he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Council, Whether he can inform the House what steps the Government intend to take in the exercise of the powers entrusted to the Privy Council by the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill for the protection of animals carried by railway or in steamers from unnecessary suffering?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the powers entrusted to us by Parliament by the Bill now speedily to become law, for the protection of animals carried by railway and in steamers from unnecessary suffering, shall have the best attention of Earl De Grey and myself, and it is a matter which each of us has much at heart. However, on considering the question, we found it would be impossible to use those powers without obtaining full information with regard to the present conditions of both railway and steamboat traffic as far as regards the carriage of animals. It was necessary to find out what was the present state of things before we could make up our minds as to the alterations to be made. Earl De Grey and myself have, therefore, appointed a Committee, consisting of gentlemen in our own Department, with a gentleman from the Board of Trade and another from the Customs, to look into the matter and make as early a Report as the nature of the inquiry will admit of. In the meantime we have seen the managers of the principal railways, and it is only justice to them to state that they have expressed great willingness to meet us in this matter. We are addressing to them a letter asking them to inform us, by an early date, at what stations they already supply water, and at what other stations they will by that time have made arrangements to supply it. When we have thus ascertained what the railways will do of themselves, it will be more easy for us to consider the serious question in what way we shall use our powers in relation to railways and steamboats.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—SLAUGHTER OF CATTLE.

QUESTION.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Council, Whether he can inform the House what steps the Government intend to take in the exercise of the powers entrusted to the Privy Council by the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill for the slaughter of fat cattle coming from infected countries at the ports of entry?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, in reply, that if the Bill to which he had just alluded became law, foreign animals coming from an infected country would be required, as now, to be killed at the port of entry. On Tuesday, or as soon as possible after the passing of the Act, a Council would be held to determine what countries were to be considered infected; and it would not be becoming in him to anticipate the Order to be issued; but they were exceedingly anxious to frame the Order in a way that should be satisfactory. If they were to lean on either side, they must lean on the side of care and caution to prevent the introduction of diseases. He would take that opportunity of correcting a mistake he had unfortunately made in reply to a Question of the hon Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), in which he had said that foot and mouth disease was prevalent in Ireland as well as England. He found that this was a mistake into which he had fallen from having been led to suppose that information respecting pleuro-pneumonia, which he regretted to be compelled to believe existed in Ireland, applied to foot and mouth disease. With regard to foot and mouth disease, he wished to state the course the Government intended to take to meet present circumstances. With regard to cattle coming in from suspected countries, they would, whether affected with foot and mouth disease or not, be killed at the port of entry, after the issue of the Order in Council he alluded to, as at present; but with regard to cattle coming in from countries not suspected, directions would be given to the Customs' officers for the present to take care that should there be in a cargo of such cattle any cattle affected with foot and mouth disease, not only those animals should be slaughtered, but the cattle which had come with them should be put under the same conditions of slaughter as if they had come from suspected countries.

THE COLNE FISHERY.—QUESTION.

DR. BREWER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If during the Recess he will take into his consideration the subject-matter of two Petitions presented to this House from the Freemen Burgesses of Colchester, praying for such effective restoration of their rights and privileges to the Colne Fishery, and certain corporate estates known as "The Severalls and Chantry," as were vested in them by ancient customs and Royal Charters?

MR. BRUCE said, in reply, that he had not had time to consider the Petitions sufficiently to enable him to give the slightest indication of the course the Government might feel it advisable to to take in the matter.

ARMY—WIMBLEDON REVIEW.

QUESTION.

In answer to Lord ELCHO,

CAPTAIN VIVIAN promised to lay on table a Letter of His Royal Highness Commanding-in-Chief respecting the recent Wimbledon Review.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[BILL 265.] [*Lords.*] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

LORD ELCHO moved the Amendment of which he had given notice—namely, that the Bill be re-committed for the purpose of leaving out, in schedule A, the words "beyond the minimum sum fixed by the Parochial and Burgh Schoolmasters (Scotland) Act (1861)." Before making any remarks on the Motion, he wished to congratulate the Lord Advocate on being so near the goal of his long labours in the cause of education, and on the prospect of a Bill for the improvement of education in Scotland becoming law during the present Session. The Bill was by no means a perfect Bill, and there was probably scarcely a Member in the House who was thoroughly satisfied with its provisions. It excluded the parochial schools entirely from its operation. It made no provision for religious teaching; and yet, by the enactment of a Conscience Clause, it implied the existence of religious teaching. Still, on the whole, he thought it was desirable that the Bill should pass. The opposition to it in this House had originated mainly on two grounds. In the first place, he regarded the incidence of taxation proposed in the Bill as unjust; and, in the second place, he entirely disapproved of the manner in which Government had attempted to force the Bill through the House. He still adhered to the opinions which he had expressed on these points, and he ventured to say that no Government, however strong, and no matter how many "thick and thin" supporters they had at their back, would again attempt to force a measure of this kind through the House in the same way. He wished to call the attention of the Lord Advocate to the provisions in the Bill relative to the change in the heritors, with whom the management of the parochial schools rested. Under this Bill, the management, instead of being confined to the heritors who were valued at £100 Scots, would be given to all who were rated in the old Scots valuation, and would include, he believed, even feuars—although he was aware that his right hon. Friend would not admit that. The effect of the alteration would be very absurd in many cases. In Haddington the amount paid by the present eleven heritors would be reduced by the vast sum of 8*s.* Some of the new heritors would pay 2½*d.* each, yet these would have an equal share in the management. In Lismahago, heritors who paid 1*d.* each would have the same power as the Duke of Hamilton. This was really carrying the principle of taxation and representation to an absurd point. He had now come to the Amendment, the effect of which he would explain. Hitherto the £35, which was the minimum statutory salary of a parochial schoolmaster, had not been considered as entitling the parish heritors to any portion of the Privy Council grant. The 5th clause in the Bill, however, laid down the principle that all assessments raised in support of the new national schools should be treated as a voluntary contribution in allocating the Privy Council grant; and he therefore saw no reason why the £35 minimum salary to the parochial schoolmaster should be excepted. When he submitted this proposal in Committee, everybody spoke in favour of it but the Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. He hoped that the Government would consent to allow this Amendment on the Bill before it finally passed.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House, in respect of an Amendment to Schedule (A),"—(*Lord Elcho,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The LORD ADVOCATE, in the first place, begged to thank his noble Friend for the manner in which he had spoken of the Bill, and for the observations which he had made in its favour. It was a great gratification to him, if he might be allowed to speak of himself, that after a great many years of labour and a great many years of difficulty they should at last have arrived close to the goal. Whether they were destined to reach it would be decided in a few hours; but he hoped they might entertain the hope that, whatever may be the materials of which this Bill was composed, it would in one shape or other be sufficiently solid and substantial to form a fabric for erecting again the fabric of Scottish education, and preserving for many generations the traditional reputation of Scotland. He wished, however, to take the opportunity of correcting a misunderstanding which had occurred in reference to what he said on a former occasion. He was represented to have said that even in Scotland the provisions of this Bill were not understood. He had never said so—he never meant to say so. What he did say was, that it would be very difficult to convey to the people of Scotland the proposals and the recommendations of the Government in reference to a measure which had been so completely altered in "another place;" and what he meant to say was, that if the Bill had not been reprinted, it never would have been possible for the people to have understood what the proposals of the Government were. In illustration of that, he had said he found that, notwithstanding their having re-printed the Bill, there were in some quarters still difficulty in knowing what their proposals were. Everybody knew that had the Amendments of the Government only been placed on the Paper, and the Bill had not been reprinted, it would have been impossible for many of the people in Scotland to have become acquainted with the views of the Government. In regard to the proposition which his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) had made, that the heritors' contribution of the minimum salary should stand in the Privy Council administration as a voluntary contribution—that matter had been considered by the Government, and he was glad to consider that that obstacle might be removed out of the way. Having considered the matter, the Government thought that the whole of the heritors' contributions should be reckoned in the sum which was to be received from the Privy Council. With that observation he could only trust that they might cherish the expectation that before many hours were past this Bill would become law.

Dr. BREWER wished to ask what amount of additional expense to the Consolidated Fund this concession to the heritors would occasion? He looked upon the question as affecting England as well as Scotland; and it was quite clear that before the question was done with the country would certainly have reason to complain of the enormous expense to which it would be put. No doubt education was a necessity; but the public were becoming rather tired of the great increase of local and imperial taxation.

Mr. ANDERSON wished to call attention to one or two inconsistencies which appeared to remain in the Bill—probably in consequence of the great haste with which the Government alterations had been made, and, in particular, of the large change in throwing the parochial schools out of the Bill. In Clause 23, for the maintenance and repair of the national schools, notwithstanding that the parochial schools were entirely thrown out of the Bill, the Board seemed still to retain the power of altering school houses, and the right of recovering from the heritors of the parish the expense of doing so. That appeared to him to be inconsistent with the fact of the parochial schools being out of the Bill. By Clause 37 the Board had also the power to dismiss parochial schoolmasters, not only for faults, but even for incapacity from old age. He did not mean to find fault with that power, because he thought it was a good power; but he wished to call attention to the inconsistency of not providing a retiring allowance for schoolmasters so dealt with. As the Bill at present stood, the school committee were absolutely prohibited from giving a retiring allowance, except in the case of national schools; and, if the parochial schoolmaster was dismissed from mere old age, there was no one to confer upon him a retiring allowance. He had not made these remarks with the view of impeding the progress of the Bill. He desired it to pass; because, although it was not a large and comprehensive measure, it was a very good Bill as far as it went. But he wished to point out the necessity of not considering this the final measure, but that it was a measure to which they must look forward to considerably extending in some future Session.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that in order to cure some of the defects referred to, he would propose that the Bill should be re-committed, in order that certain Amendments might be inserted in Clauses 13, 16, 21, 23, 28, and 65, and the Schedule.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Moved, That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, before the Bill was re-committed he wished to say a few words. The Lord Advocate had taken exception to some words which were used the other day on that side of the House. The hon. and learned Lord was under the impression that the words used were "that Scotch education might wait, but that the House of Lords could not wait." But this was a misapprehension. Without venturing to express any opinion on the course that might be adopted by the other House, he would say that there was one thing which he thought the Government would find could not and would not wait, and that was the resolute determination of the rate-payers of this country no longer to submit to that grinding burden of local taxation which never seemed to decrease. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had the other day commended to the hon. Members during the Recess the consideration of the subject of coinage. He (Mr. Lowther) would venture to suggest for the consideration of those who wished during the Recess to consider matters which would have to be brought before Parliament, the amount of opposition which would be offered to any scheme of education which would be likely to involve any addition to the present local burdens.

Mr. BRUCE accepted the statement of the hon. Gentleman as notice that he would oppose any English Education Bill founded upon rating. He was hardly justified, however, in attacking the present Bill, for among all the representations from Scotland which had reached hon. Members on the subject, there were not any which had reference to the extension of rating.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood him. He did not say he would oppose any Bill founded on rating; but he warned the Government that any addition to local burdens, until some adjustment had been made of local taxation, would meet with the most determined opposition.

Lord ELCHO expressed a hope that the Government would bear in mind, when they came to consider the question the incidence of taxation, that this was not a rich man's question, but much more a poor man's question.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for Third Reading *discharged.*

Bill *re-committed* in respect of Clauses 13, 16, 21, 23, 28, 65, and the Schedule."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Considered in Committee, and *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, *considered.*

Moved, That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. BRUCE expressed his regret that he was not able to fulfil the undertaking he had entered into on Saturday to mention to the House the names of the members of the new Board. He was unable to do so for this reason—It would be easily understood that the matter was one of very great difficulty and considerable complexity, and the number being so limited it was necessary to take into consideration many circumstances, and a variety of interests which were involved. The Government had the matter under consideration for some time, but they had considerable doubt as to the manner in which the Board should be framed. It was found impossible to name the Commissioners to the House, there not having been sufficient time to select them and submit their names to Her Majesty. He was glad, however, for the satisfaction of the House, to state that in appointing the Secretary to the Board the Government had determined on appointing a layman.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time and *passed,* with Amendments.

MERCHANT SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Acts read; *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, in rising to move that the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to Merchant Shipping and Navigation, said, that on an early day in the present Session his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade gave a pledge that before the close of it he would lay on the table of the House the long promised Merchant Shipping Bill. When the present Government came into Office they found that very little advance had been made with it; in the interval incessant work had been applied to it at the Board of Trade, and the result was that they were now able to redeem that pledge, and the Bill, the size of which, he feared, would alarm many Members, would shortly be in circulation. At the same time his right hon. Friend had thought that it would not be right to the great interests concerned that they should present such a Bill to the House without some explanation of the changes proposed in it; it would be waste of labour for anyone without some guide to travel through the 800 clauses of the Bill, and, by comparison with the existing law, to ascertain those changes; he had, therefore, permitted him (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) to make a statement with reference to them, which he promised should be as short as possible. Before doing so, however, he should wish to say a few words upon the present condition of our merchant shipping compared with what it was when last this great subject was before the House in 1854. In 1854 the registered tonnage of this country and her possessions was 5,155,000. It was now 7,232,000 tons, of which 5,700,000 belonged to the United Kingdom, showing an increase of 41 per cent. The real increase, however, had been even greater, for in 1854 the Register was in a very bad state, and was encumbered by a very large number of vessels which did not exist; great pains had since been taken to clear that Register of these non-existing vessels, and it now represented within a few thousand tons the actual number and tonnage of vessels. Another return of the vessels belonging to and actually employed in the United Kingdom showed the increase since 1854 to be over 50 per cent. He believed, therefore, he might take the increase of British shipping at 50 per cent. His right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade took occasion recently to state in public that he believed that at the present time the sea-going shipping under the British flag was equal, if not superior, to that of all the rest of the world. Exception was taken to this statement in the papers, but he believed it to have been substantially correct. The aggregate tonnage of all other countries as given in their most recent returns was 9,794,000 tons; but from this very great reductions had to be made in order to compare it with our own. The United States return included her river and lake tonnage, amounting to considerably over 2,000,000 tons. The registers of most of the Continental States included many thousands of fishing boats and small craft of all kinds down to canal boats. Making these and other deductions which seemed proper for the purpose of comparing with our own figures, he could not take the aggregate of sea-going foreign tonnage to be more than 7,150,000, against 7,230,000 of this country and her possessions. When they looked at the materials of which it was composed the difference was still greater. He did not hesitate to affirm that the tonnage of our sea-going steamers was more than double that of all other countries put together. These proportions were more favourable to us than at any previous period. While our tonnage had increased 50 per cent in the last fourteen years, the tonnage of France had remained nearly stationary, and had actually diminished the last ten years by 3 per cent. Dutch tonnage had decreased 13 per cent. The sea-going vessels of the United States had diminished 50 per cent in the last ten years. Much of this last was, doubtless, due to the destruction of their commerce during their great war; but it was also due in great part to the commercial policy since the war. A very large number of vessels were during the war transferred under simulated papers to our flag; but at the close of the war Congress passed an Act prohibiting the re-registration of these vessels as American, on the ground that having fled the flag during the time of danger, they were not entitled to share in its advantages in time of peace. They had also adopted a tariff which had almost put an end to their shipbuilding trade. He would take again the shipbuilding trade as a test of progress. The tonnage built in this country had increased from 196,000 tons in 1854 to 379,000 tons in 1868, a year of much depression, as compared with two or three previous years. During the same period the tonnage built in France had diminished from 94,000 tons to 81,000 tons; in Holland from 55,000 to 25,000. In the United States the building of sea-going vessels had almost been extinguished. In Norway alone was there any increase —namely, from 29,000 to 43,000. One further illustration he might give. In 1854, of an aggregate of 18,669,000 tons entering and clearing our ports for foreign trade, 10,744,000 tons were British, 7,924,000 under foreign flags—a proportion of 57 per cent British to 43 per cent foreign. In 1868, out of 33,680,000 tons, 22,660,000 were British, and 11,020,000 foreign, showing an increase of 120 per cent for British against 37 per cent foreign, the new proportion being 67 per cent British to 33 per cent foreign. Having described the progress of shipping, he must say a few words of their crews. While the tonnage of the United Kingdom had increased 50 per cent, the number of seamen had increased since 1854 from 162,400 to 197,500, or 21 per cent. Of these 8 per cent were foreigners in 1854, and 12 per cent in 1868, showing an increased proportion of foreigners, although by no means an alarming one. The proportion of men to tonnage in our coasting trade had remained about the same; but in our sailing vessels employed in the foreign trade the proportion of men had fallen from 3·97 per 100 tons in 1854 to 2·90 in 1868, and for steamers from 7·69 to 5 men per 100 tons. Taking the whole force of merchant vessels there had been a reduction of one man for every 100 tons. In other words, if the same number of men were now required to man these vessels as in 1854 we should want 55,000 more sailors. This reduction had been due, in some respects, to the increased average size of our vessels; but it was also due to greater economy of all kinds in working them, to the use of machinery, and to the adoption of double topsails, patent block, steam windlass, and other means of economizing labour in our sailing vessels. As an illustration of this economy, he had been able to procure the actual number of men employed on twenty-two large sailing vessels at three different periods. In 1849, the crews of these vessels numbered 463, of whom 227 were able seamen. In 1859, their crews were 417, of whom 188 were able seamen; and, in 1869, the crews of the same vessels, making very much the same voyages, were 348, of whom 153 were able seamen; showing a reduction of 25 per cent since 1849. Had this economy of labour tended to increased risk? He found it difficult to answer the question. Accurate information on the relative proportion of casualties was not to be had; till lately the wreck returns were badly kept. From the information, however, he had received from Lloyds, he believed it was safe to say that there had been a reduction in the premiums for insurance on the principal voyages of vessels engaged in the long sea trade; but it was also stated that much of this reduction was due to increased competition among underwriters. It would, however, be satisfactory if the ratio of losses remained the same; because that would shew that the economy effected in the number of the crew had not increased risks, and had not, therefore, been effected without reason. He had quoted these figures in no spirit of boasting, but with the view of showing how vast were the interests affected by the Bill he proposed. They showed how idle were the fears of those who dreaded the repeal of the Navigation Laws, and they were also, on the whole, testimony to the general well working of modern legislation affecting shipping. That legislation might be said to have commenced in 1850, when the late Lord Taunton, then Mr. Labouchere, first provided for the examination of masters and mates of foreign-going vessels, established shipping offices for the protection of seamen, and provided for inquiries into wrecks. The next great change was in 1853-4, when his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War, then at the Board of Trade, placed the Trinity House under the control of the Board of Trade, and threw open our coasting trade to foreign vessels, and, lastly, consolidated all previous legislation in the great Act of 1854, which had since been the groundwork of our shipping laws. In the course of this he provided for a complete revision of the ship registry, for a new system of measuring tonnage, and for a limitation of the liability of owners in cases of collision. Since that time not a year had passed without additions or amendments to that Act. In 1856 seamen's savings-banks and money orders were established. In 1862 Mr. Milner Gibson extended examinations to engineers, laid down rules as to lights, and provided summary proceedings in salvage cases. In 1864, the Anchors and Chain Cables Act was passed. In 1868, Admiralty jurisdiction was given to County Courts, and this year an important Act was passed with reference to colonial merchant shipping. In the same time shipping had been relieved from a variety of local charges, passing dues and charitable charges; exemptions in favour of particular vessels and differential dues against foreign vessels had been disposed of. He had mentioned but a few of the changes, but, in fact, seventeen or eighteen Acts had been passed since 1854 regulating the business of shipowners, and interlacing one with the other in such a manner that on a subject in which, above all others, it was important there should be clearness and certainty, so that he who sailed might read, there was so much complexity and uncertainty that only experts could say what was the law. Consolidation, in fact, was almost as much needed now as it was in 1854, and although there was not so much field for improvement, there was still much to be done in detail. It was proposed, then, in the Bill which he should ask leave to introduce, to consolidate all these Acts, and include one great branch which was omitted in 1854 — namely, the Acts relating to harbours and the protection of navigation, the working of which had since been placed under the Board of Trade, and to take this opportunity of introducing a number of Amendments which the experience of the last few years had shown to be desirable. In doing this they had the advantage of the aid of Mr. Farrer, the Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade, who assisted in the preparation of the Act of 1854, and all subsequent Acts, and who had been concerned in their good administration. In describing the proposed changes, he thought it would be most convenient to the House that he should advert to them in the order in which they appeared in the Bill. He should be able to do little more than indicate them, without going at length into the reasons which had induced them to adopt them. The first item related to the registry and measurement of ships. It was proposed in future to make more stringent rules against the change of the name of a ship. A clause in the Act of 1854 was aimed at this, but as it only affected British ships, and did not prevent the registration of foreign ships under any name coming into the hands of British owners, advantage was taken of this and vessels had not unfrequently been sold under simulated bills of sale to foreigners, and resold for registration under new names, and thus vessels had been able to get rid of a character and underwriters and the public had been taken in. This would be prohibited in the future. It was also proposed to give greater facilities for the registration of ships in foreign ports. A fine would be substituted for confiscation in the case of vessels improperly sailing under the British flag. With respect to the measurement of tonnage, on which the important question of port dues and other charges depended, there was no intention to alter the system under which the gross tonnage of vessels was ascertained by measuring their actual cubical contents. It had given great satisfaction, and had been adopted by nearly all other countries. The deductions, however, allowed to steamers in respect of their engine rooms and coal bunkers had been calculated on a system of percentages, which had given rise to inequalities, and vessels were sometimes built to avail themselves of the greatest amount of deduction. He believed that in some few cases steamers had been proved to be of a minus quantity of tonnage. It was proposed therefore to measure these deductions in the future on the same principle by which the gross tonnage was ascertained. Another point dealt with under this head arose out of the question of deck cargoes. Complaints had been made, and particularly in the Baltic trade, that vessels had been overloaded with deck cargoes; and the Board of Trade had been pressed from time to time to prohibit the carrying of deck cargoes. They had, however, objected to this on the ground that for certain trades and for certain seasons it was not unreasonable or improper to carry deck cargoes, and that to prohibit them altogether would unnecessarily interfere with trade; but it had seemed to them that if such cargoes were carried, port and other dues ought to be paid in respect of it, and, accordingly, they had provided that vessels might be registered to carry deck cargo, a proportionate tonnage being added for that purpose; but if when not so registered they carried deck cargo, they would have to pay double tonnage dues. The next part of the Bill had relation to masters and seamen. It was proposed that in future the examiners of masters and other officers should be placed directly under the Board of Trade, instead of as now under the Local Marine Boards; it was believed that greater uniformity or a higher average standard of qualification would be maintained by the adoption of this course. Already great good had resulted from these examinations, but there was room for improvement among the masters of the smaller class of foreign-going vessels. As to seamen, coasters were to be exempted altogether in future from the obligation to have written agreements. Foreign-going ships were to be allowed to have running agreements, so that they did not extend over more than a year. And during that time they might engage men and discharge men at any port at home or abroad on complying with the other provisions of the Act. Another change had in view the protection of seamen from crimps. He found that one of the greatest evils the seamen suffered from was that, on the termination of the voyage at our great seaports, they were generally discharged or left their ship immediately on arrival, but they were seldom paid their wages till four or five days afterwards. In the meantime they had to hang about the port without money. They fell into the hands of the crimps and other bad characters who haunted the purlieus of the docks, who advanced them money and tempted them into debauchery. The seamen often did not get out of the hands of these persons till they had lost everything, and had pledged their future wages by advance notes, going on board again ill-clothed and often suffering from disease and the effects of drink. He believed that few things would do more good than some provision which would enable the seamen at once to proceed to their homes after arrival in dock. It was provided in the Act of 1854 that the seamen should be paid one-fourth of the wages due to them on discharge from the vessel. This, however, was rarely carried out. It was proposed that the discharge at the shipping office should be not later than one day after the arrival of the vessel or the termination of the agreement, or, if not, that the wages should run on until such discharge. This would give a great inducements to owners to pay the men at once. Facilities would, at the same time, be given to seamen to authorize the shipping officers to receive and remit their wages for them, so that they might leave the neighbourhood on arrival. Other minor provisions were directed against the crimps, with whom the Board of Trade had waged a constant warfare. The next point he had to deal with was that of distressed seamen abroad. The House would recollect that the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr.

Graves), a few nights since, raised a question on this point on the Vote for distressed seamen, on the ground that the Vote was yearly increasing; he complained also on behalf of the owners of steam vessels who were compelled to bring home these distressed seamen at considerable expense. The question was one of considerable difficulty. A large proportion of the seamen relieved and sent home in this way were the crews of vessels wrecked abroad, in respect of whom no one could raise a complaint. Others were colonial seamen, for whom they thought the colonies in future should pay; but others were men who had been discharged from their ships, or had deserted in foreign ports, and who had afterwards been found destitute and unable to find a berth in a ship. The obligation to return these men to their homes was one which they owed to the country in which they were found. It was like the case of the removal of paupers to the parish bound to support them, and the question was at whose expense ought this to be carried out. In old times any voyage was presumed to be out and home, and no voyages were terminated in a foreign port. Now, however, it was different; voyages were often seeking voyages; many vessels were sent out for sale. The Bill they proposed would give facilities for the engagement and discharge of men in any part of the world. But they still thought, on the whole, that the principle of the Act of 1854 should not be departed from, and that the ship taking men out to a foreign port and there discharging them should be liable to the expense of bringing them home again if they were unable to find other employment, or if they were destitute there. The clauses of the Act, however, were ambiguous, and they only applied to foreign ports, and not to colonial ports. It was proposed to simplify them, to extend them to colonial ports, and to provide that no seaman should be left abroad without a discharge from some functionary, with whom the wages or a sum sufficient to bring the man home should be deposited. As between the Government and the shipowner, the ship was to be liable for expenses incurred on behalf of the man, except in cases of proved desertion. As between the seaman and the ship, the ship was only to be liable when the man was discharged without fault on his part, but not otherwise. Another change to be noted here was one due to his right hon. Friend at the head of the Admiralty. Under the present law any seaman might leave his ship for the purpose of entering the Royal Navy, and for that purpose might demand his clothes and wages without regard to the convenience of the owner or master of the ship he left. This privilege had at times been abused, and had caused great complaints from shipowners. Though the practice had been much less frequent of late years, the practice of hanging out the red shirt in presence of a ship of war was still occasionally resorted to. But his right hon. Friend had consented to forego this privilege of the Navy except in time of war. The next part of the Act had relation to safety and provision against accidents at sea. The present law contained numerous minute regulations as to the number of boats, the use of lifebelts, the safety valves of engines, compasses, and other such like matters. It was proposed to simplify these and to leave it to the Board of Trade to decide what in the case of passenger ships should be the actual requirements. A provision would be inserted empowering the master to throw overboard dangerous goods if they had been sent on board without his consent. At present the master might refuse to receive such goods, but once on board he was bound to carry them. Another change had reference to the inquiries into wrecks and the misconduct of officers. It would be admitted by everyone that there was no more legitimate and proper function of Government than to inquire into these cases of loss. He believed they had done much good in bringing home responsibility to owners and masters. As at present constituted, the courts of inquiry combined two functions—the one to inquire into the cause of the loss of the vessel, the other to determine the innocence or neglect of the master and officers; and, as the latter was followed, by most serious consequences — namely, the loss of their certificates and ruin in their profession —the inquiries were too apt to be conducted as if they were penal proceedings against the officers, instead of being inquests before which everything should be brought out bearing upon the loss of the vessel. It was proposed, therefore, in the new Bill to separate these two inquiries, and to hold an inquiry or inquest on the loss of the vessel, on which there should be a general report of the Board of Trade; and, if there were sufficient cause, to hold a separate inquiry into the conduct of the officers. A complaint was made that in such cases the Board of Trade were at once prosecutors and judges, appointing the assessors; it was proposed that in future the assessors should be appointed by the Admiralty Court. With respect to wrecks which happened on our coasts, they had carefully revised the Bill with a view of strengthening the law against the robberies which too often occurred. He need hardly remind the House of the scandalous cases which had been reported to it within the last three or four years arising out of the wrecks of the *North*, the *Kit Karson* and the *Olivia*. These and some other cases which had occurred to foreign vessels had given us a very bad reputation abroad, and no efforts should be spared to prevent a recurrence of them. They proposed that where wrecks had occurred, and property was found in possession of persons in the neighbourhood presumedly taken from them, the onus should be thrown upon the holders of showing that they came honestly by it. He trusted that, with some other amendments, and with a more careful administration of existing laws, which the Board of Trade had lately arranged, they would be able to put a check upon these scandalous cases. He might here mention another change due to his right hon. Friend at the Admiralty with reference to naval salvage. At present salvage in respect of merchant vessels might be claimed by officers and men in the Royal Navy, and proceedings might be taken by them against the ship in any Admiralty Court. Before final adjudication, however, the consent of the Admiralty must be given. His right hon. Friend proposed that in future such claims should only be made by the Admiralty itself; and the owner would be relieved from having his vessel taken into port and detained by the local Admiralty Court pending proceedings. The number of claims of this kind was already very small, and it was believed that this proposal would further reduce them, and prevent any claim being set up except in cases where there was substantial cause for some recompense for services rendered. He now came to the last subject which he had to mention—the vexed question of pilotage. There were, no doubt, very strong arguments against the compulsory pilotage. It was alleged, with truth, he believed, that where pilotage was not compulsory, pilots were as numerous and as experienced. On the other hand, there was a very strong desire to maintain it in some parts of the country with a view to insure the supply of competent men. The Government thought that even if it were desirable to put an end to compulsion it would not be well to raise the question on a Consolidation Bill. There were, however, anomalies in the existing law which the Government thought ought to be amended. Great injustice and absurdity had arisen from the law which exempted a ship from liability for damage when in charge of a compulsory pilot. The chief question in many, if not most, recent cases had been not which ship was to blame, but was either of the ships in charge of a compulsory pilot. The consequent refinements, absurdities, and injustice was very remarkable. To meet this it was proposed that where ships were not otherwise exempted from compulsory pilotage they should pay for a pilot, but should not be bound to employ him or to be placed under his charge. The money would be paid, where a pilot offered and was not employed, to the pilotage authorities, to be devoted to the pilot fund, as they might determine. The Government proposed, also, that the exemptions from pilotage which now existed in the Thames and the outports should be extended to other pilotage districts; and further that the recovery of pilotage rates should be by civil process, and not, as at present, by criminal proceedings. They proposed also to give the Trinity House power to license pilots for the seas surrounding Great Britain outside the present pilotage districts, but not in any way to make their employment compulsory. It was also intended to take more stringent powers to compel local authorities to keep their lights in a satisfactory condition, and, if they failed in doing so, to enable the general lighthouse authorities to take them in hand. Power would be given to the Board of Trade to prevent injury to navigation by throwing ballast into navigable waters or by taking shingle from the shores. Power also would be given to local authorities to remove wrecks which were an obstruction to navigation, and to charge the expense on the property. The Government also proposed to give the Board of Trade power to prepare provisional orders dealing with those cases of local charges upon shipping or passing dues which still existed, and which only survived because of the expense of applying for local Acts. He had now gone through the details on which the Government proposed changes. There were numerous other amendments, having for their object greater simplicity or more perfect remedies, which it was unnecessary to notice. The House would perceive that the tendency of the amendments proposed was not in the direction of more minute regulations or further inspection. The experience of the Board of Trade was not favourable to such legislation. It tended to shift the responsibility from the shipbuilder or shipowner to some inspecting officer, and in some cases had certainly retarded improvements. The Bill he asked leave to introduce had been prepared by the Board of Trade out of the materials and experience at its hand; but he by no means wished to exclude the possibility of further amendments. The object of presenting it at this period of the Session was to give full time to those who were interested in this great subject to examine it during the Recess, and the Government would gladly receive from them their criticism and suggestions. He hoped they would recollect, however, that it was the duty of the Board of Trade, in considering these suggestions, to hold the balance between the various conflicting interests, and to regard them from the point of view of the public interest. In conclusion, he could not express a better hope than that the Bill, when it passed into law, might be succeeded by a period in which the extension of British shipping would be as great in proportion as in the period which had preceded it. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the Resolution.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he desired to express his satisfaction with the general purposes of the Board of Trade in the introduction of this measure, it being manifestly for the advantage of shipping that the law affecting so large a section of the trading community should be embraced within the four corners of one statute, instead of being spread over numberless Acts of Parliament. The Act of 1854 did much in the way of consolidation; but since then one or two Acts had been passed every year, so that at the present moment the Mercantile Marine was under seventeen or eighteen different Acts of Parliament. It was better for a Department to wait its opportunity and delay legislation for two or even for five years than to pass immature legislation in an inconvenient form. The great consolidating Poor Law Act passed in 1834; but it still left on the statute book 100 Acts affecting the administration of poor relief. Since 1834, at least three Acts a year had been passed affecting this subject, directly or indirectly, so that there were about 200 statutes governing and constituting the Poor Law system. The result was that there was no single man in the country—neither the President, the Secretary, nor any of the able officials of that Department—who was able to speak with confidence as to his knowledge of the whole of the Poor Law. He regretted very much to hear the statement of his hon. Friend as to compulsory pilotage being retained. No system would be permanent and final which did not establish perfect free trade in pilotage. His hon. Friend was perfectly aware of the pinch that was felt as the law now stood. A ship, value £50,000, navigating the same waters as a ship value £1,000, or value £50, might be free to take a pilot or not, as she thought proper, while the ship of smaller value was bound to take and to pay for a pilot. What his hon. Friend proposed to do would not much improve matters. Was it to be seriously propounded to the House of Commons at this time of day that the trade of this country was to be compelled to pay for services which it did not require and would not accept? No trade should be subjected by Act of Parliament to anything so unfair; and he hoped, therefore, that this provision would disappear from the Bill next year. There was another matter also which he thought very objectionable, and that was that the Board of Trade should supersede the local management of harbour lights; because it was proposed that when the Board of Trade were not satisfied with the way in which the lights were kept, they might make provisions of their own for their maintenance. In his opinion, the tendency of legislation should be in an entirely opposite direction. He hoped his hon. Friend would put all the legislation that would be operative for the government of our shipping trade into the statute, and not make the Board of Trade a legislative Department. The House of Commons ought not to delegate any of its authority to an executive body. There was very much legislation at present in the hands of the Board of Trade, and it would be a great advantage to the public at large if it were denuded of that power. Another thing which he hoped would be aimed at was to minimize legislation. Let them not intrude by legislation where it was possible to avoid such intrusion. The more that was left to the free action of man and man, and to open bargain in the open market, the better for all parties. As to the measuring of steamers, the greatest absurdities prevailed at present. The mode of allowing for engine space and other things was such that in some cases the deductions had amounted to more than the whole gross tonnage of the ships themselves, which, therefore, were not charged tonnage rates at all. While he was not prepared to support the prohibition of deck cargoes altogether, he agreed in the necessity of discouraging them as much as possible.

SIR JOHN HAY said, that the question of deck loads and the stowage of cargo deserved the attention of the Board of Trade. The latter subject had been investigated with great care and advantage by the Institution of Naval Architects, and if the Board of Trade should put itself into communication with that body they would receive some exceedingly valuable information. It was well known that from carelessness or a desire to carry large cargoes, great weights were often put at the extremities or in other parts of the ship where it could not be safely carried, the consequence of which was that the ships became strained and unmanageable, and frequent losses occurred. It should be made legally binding that in each section of the ship only a given maximum weight should be carried, a matter also of great interest to underwriters and insurance offices. With respect to the payment of merchant seamen's wages, he was not quite sure what course was indicated by his hon. Friend; but it had been found in the Navy that great advantage both to discipline and morality had arisen from the fact that payment was made through the Post Office at the place to which the man belonged, so that his family got the benefit of his wages rather than crimps and such persons. If some such measure were adopted by the Board of Trade in the case of the merchant seamen, the greatest benefit would be found to result. With reference to the total abrogation of the powers of naval officers to avail themselves of the services of men volunteering from the merchant service, he did not think it would be advantageous. War vessels on foreign stations often lost numbers of men through the bad climate. To deprive a merchant ship entirely of the means of navigation would be unfair; but in many parts of the world Lascars, Malays, and Chinese and other foreigners might be found who would be able to do all that was necessary for the safe navigation of the merchantman. As our Navy was sent to different parts of the world for the purpose of protecting our trade, he hoped his hon. Friend would not make imperative the total abrogation of the powers of naval officers to accept the services of volunteers from the merchant service. Notwithstanding that some hardships had occasionally arisen in consequence of salvage being claimed by the officers and crews of Her Majesty's ships, he thought the power should be left to the Admiralty to decide whether any and what compensation should be awarded to Her Majesty's seamen for services rendered to vessels in distress. He was glad to hear that compulsory pilotage was not to be abolished; but he could not agree with the Board of Trade upon the subject of the rule of the road at sea, and he could only hope that the number of accidents that would occur during the ensuing autumn, in consequence of Regulation No. 14, might not be such as to open the eyes of the hon. Member to the danger of the present system.

MR. WATKIN WILLIAMS said, he differed from the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) with respect to compulsory pilotage, but the law on that subject was in considerable confusion. Compulsory pilotage was derived from the laws of Oleron, and was first established in this country by Richard I., in 1195, with the view of keeping our home navigation secret from foreigners. The chief argument in its favour in these days was that it secured an efficient staff of pilots; and he thought that a shipowner should not be at liberty, from a false notion of economy, to refuse to avail himself of the services of skilled navigators. At the same time, the owner's responsibility in the case of his ship running down another ought not to be superseded by the pilot, and he entirely concurred in the provisions of the Bill upon this point.

Mr. HENLEY said, he hoped that next Session a continuous Return would be published showing the proportion of wrecks to voyages during the last three or four years, that they might see whether their lodging the management of shipping to so large an extent in the hands of the Government had resulted in more or fewer wrecks.

Mr. STEVENSON said, they had never had compulsory pilotage on the North-eastern coast, yet they had never experienced any want of properly qualified pilots. He regretted that the measure did not propose to go to the root of the evil at once, and abolish compulsory pilotage altogether. He also thought that light dues should be put an end to. At all events, he hoped the extraordinary anomalies in the mode of charging them would be remedied. He was glad to understand that an inquiry would be instituted by the Government into the cause of every wreck that occurred—whether culpability on the part of the master or mate was or was not alleged.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he had been asked a question by his hon. and gallant Friend opposite (Sir John Hay), who had left the House, with respect to the power of merchant seamen to volunteer into the Navy in spite of their engagements. It was not intended wholly to repeal that power, but only to abandon its exercise in time of peace. The effect of the Bill would be that during such times and for such places as Her Majesty, by proclamation, might appoint, this power, in circumstances of urgency, might be enforced. With regard to compulsory pilotage the Government had arrived at no decision. The Bill did not alter the law on that subject; but it was the intention of the Board of Trade to consider the subject during the Recess, and it would depend upon the result of that inquiry whether they would abolish it or not.

Mr. GOURLEY said, he was strongly of opinion that if shipowners were to be compelled to pay for pilotage, pilots should be made responsible for damage done to ships when under their charge. There were many anomalies in our pilotage system. It should either be done away with altogether, or the scale of charges should be so arranged as to make them less burdensome to the London shipowners. He objected to the examination of masters and mates by the Board of Trade, considering that the local Marine Boards had done their work well, and better than it could have been done by the Board of Trade.

Mr. MACFIE said, he thought that the action of the Board of Trade in this subject entitled it to the thanks of the shipping interest. There would be no harm in preventing vessels from going to sea until they had undergone some kind of inspection, as a means of protecting the lives of the seamen. It was worthy of consideration whether there should not be some limit to the number of foreign seamen on board. There should be uniformity in the various ports, both as to the charges and the number of times the vessels were to be charged port dues, according to the number of voyages.

Mr. BOWRING said, he thought it a serious objection to the Bill that it consisted of 800 clauses. If the suggestions now made were adopted it might easily be extended to 1,000 clauses. It was already about six times as long as the Bankruptcy Bill, which was the longest measure of the Session. Many of the clauses might be made rules of court, in which case they might be struck out, and the Board of Trade left to make the necessary regulations.

Mr. BENTALL said, he hoped that the Board of Trade would give some consideration to the present practice of charging the whole of the light dues upon a ship whether she possessed a full cargo or not—a practice which was a great hindrance to trade. He lived in a port in the South of England, to which coals were brought, and the merchants there were constantly requiring to send back small quantities of cargo; but they could only send them upon the condition of being subject to very heavy dues, which was a great grievance.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the question of local dues would be considered and re-adjusted. He wished to explain that there was no imputation cast upon the local Marine Boards; but it was desired to have greater uniformity in the examination. The statistics alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) should be laid upon the table of the House at the commencement of next Session, together with a great quantity of other statistical matter. He thanked the House for the manner in which the Bill had been received.

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to Merchant Shipping and Navigation.

House *resumed.*

Resolution *reported*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, and Mr. John Bright.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 267.]

COAL MINE ACCIDENTS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Lord ELCHO, in rising to call attention to a Memorial signed on behalf of 30,000 Miners, praying for a special inquiry into the recent accidents in Coal Mines that have resulted in great loss of life, and to move for Papers on the subject, said, the public journals continually furnished their readers with the accounts of accidents in mines, which were attended with great loss of life. On one occasion 350 men were suddenly hurried into eternity, and in July and June last two explosions were attended with the death of something like sixty men on each occasion. Knowing that the men engaged in these mines attributed the constant recurrence of these accidents to the absence of proper inspection, he had some short time since asked his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would not, even at that late period of the Session, introduce a measure which would have the effect of making the working in mines more safe than it now was, and whether he would not in any case exercise the powers vested in him to order the inspection of such mines. In supposing that the minds of these men would be greatly excited by these accidents he was not wrong, because a meeting was held only the other day at Manchester, which was attended by 120 delegates, representing a body of 30,000 men in Lancashire. He had had the honour of presenting to the Secretary of State for the Home Department a Memorial signed by these 120 delegates, and they had likewise signed a Petition which he had that day presented to that House. In that Petition they urged that they were very much alarmed at the frequent occurrence of accidents, which they believed might be guarded against; they were not satisfied with having inquiries before coroners' juries, and they prayed that that House would present an Address to Her Majesty praying for the institution of a sufficient inquiry by scientific men into these explosions. He should be very glad if his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department would accede to this request. He believed that these accidents might be frequently prevented by proper precautions. At all events, they might he believed, be more guarded against; because a Committee of that House, which sat for two Sessions on the question, had reported in favour of the amendment of the existing acts on mines, and the Home Secretary had brought in a Bill to render the working of these mines more secure than it was at present. The very fact of a Bill having been brought in by the right hon. Gentleman appeared to admit that the position taken up by these men was a sound one. He did not know to what extent inspection existed in Saxony; but he observed that a lamentable explosion had taken place there by which 420 persons had been hurried into eternity; and the correspondent of *The Times* stated that the grossest possible carelessness prevailed there as to uncovered lights; the men, too, being allowed to go about smoking. It was not, therefore, surprising that there should be such a holocaust of victims to such reprehensible carelessness. He regretted that pressure of business had prevented the right hon. Gentleman from persevering with his Bill, because he thought it might have been passed without difficulty. No doubt there were a great many Amendments put down in reference to that Bill; but there had been two meetings, one at his own house and another in a committee room, which had been attended by mine owners and the representatives of miners, and also by some of the most influential men in that House, and after what had occurred at those meetings he thought that portion of the Bill which related to the measures to be taken for the security of life and prevention of accidents might have been got through without difficulty. He regretted that his right hon. Friend did not try to press the measure through the House. But that Bill having been brought in, containing such clauses, was some justification for these men feeling so strongly as they did that their interests had not been sufficiently looked after—a measure of that importance not being pressed earnestly on the consideration of Parliament. Those men believed that until a more searching inquiry was made into the accidents that occurred they would not get at the root of the evil, and he should be very glad if his right hon. Friend would do what they wanted, which was to cause special scientific inquiry to be made into this matter. They thought a mine might be made so secure that even with an uncovered light in the working part of it there would be no risk of explosion. The way in which mines were inspected was not such as to give the security required. The view taken by his right hon. Friend was that they could not have personal, actual, ocular inspection of all mines in the United Kingdom—they could only appoint a certain number of Inspectors, who, if they had reason to believe there was anything wrong, or if an accident occurred in their district, should go and inquire into it and report what had passed. The memorialists held that this was practically no inspection at all. If they looked to other countries inspection there meant actual inspection. If this question arose in America thorough and complete inspection would be given. There were no inflammatory gases in the American mines, but there was a great deal of timbering. They had actual inspection in America, and the way it was accomplished was this—once every year every mine had to be inspected to see that there was a proper supply of timbering to the shafts, &c., and the owner of the mine paid so much — 10 cents, he believed — upon every yard inspected during the year. It had been said on behalf of the Government that the inspection of mines should be like that of railways, and that those inspections were only had after some accident or complaint; but there was no analogy between railways and mines. A railway was perfectly made, and there it was; but mines were being continually made. No doubt it would be necessary greatly to increase the number of Inspectors if they had actual inspection, but he understood that one of the Inspectors had admitted that there ought to be more Inspectors. [Mr. Bruce: No!] He knew his right hon. Friend would say it would take away responsibility from the mine owner if they had more inspection; but he thought there should be sub-Inspectors reporting to the Chief inspectors, which would not interfere with the working of the mine. He hoped his right hon. Friend would take this matter into his serious consideration, with a view to legislation, and that in the meantime he would not turn a deaf ear to the Petition of these miners, praying for a scientific inquiry into these accidents, for he must say, of all working men these were the most hardworking and industrious, on whom, to a great extent, depended the material wealth and the prosperity of the country.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Memorial presented to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, praying for special inquiry into the recent Accidents in Coal Mines."—(*Lord Elcho.*)

Mr. BRUCE said, he was certainly not prepared by the Notice which the noble Lord had given for a discussion on the general subject of mine inspection; nor did he think the present a fitting opportunity for it. His noble Friend requested that he should accede to the Memorial of a large number of miners in Lancashire and send down a number of scientific men to inquire into the cause of two recent accidents. He told his noble Friend some time ago that if any application were made from the locality he would take care that the inquiry should be duly attended by scientific men on the part of the Government. The Inspector of the district attended the inquiry as a matter of course; but he applied for assistance, and, in consequence, one of the ablest of the Inspectors, Mr. Dickenson, was sent down to assist, and he believed every step had been taken that could serve to trace the cause of this most deplorable calamity. Since he had received the Memorial he had communicated with these two Inspectors, and asked them whether, in their opinion, any further scientific investigation was necessary in order to arrive at the cause of this accident? If the causes of such accidents could not be discovered by the Inspectors at the inquests which were held, it would be quite proper that a scientific inquiry should be made. The two main causes of accidents were defective ventilation and the negligence of the agents and the workmen themselves. Defective ventilation could, no doubt, be removed by stringent legislation; but many accidents were owing to the neglect of the agents and of the men themselves, and this was, of course, beyond the control of Parliament. Had he been able to pass the Mines Regulation Bill through Parliament during the present Session, he would gladly have done so. Notice of important Amendments extending over twelve pages of the Notice Paper, had been given, and he thought his noble Friend did not properly estimate the length and gravity of the discussions which would have arisen on the measure if it had been proceeded with. It was a Consolidation Bill, and, consequently, would have opened up *de novo* a great many old as well as new questions. With respect to the number of Inspectors, his noble Friend had quoted the original Act of 1820 for the inspection of mines, and had argued from that Act that the Legislature intended there should be a complete and continuous inspection of mines. He thought, however, that the intention of that Act was clearly shown by the action of the Government immediately after it became law, when only six Inspectors were appointed for the whole country. If it had been intended that there should be a personal inspection of all the mines in Great Britain it would have been absurd to appoint so small a number of Inspectors as six. In his opinion, efficient ventilation and efficient precautions against accident could only be obtained by the active co-operation of the masters, agents, and workmen. Some of the worst accidents had happened from causes which had only been in operation a few days, against which, therefore, mere occasional inspection would have given no security. That at the Oaks Colliery arose from the accumulation of gas for a week. If his noble Friend would refer to the Reports of last year, he would find in the Report of one of the Inspectors an account by Mr. Dalgleish of the system pursued in the North of England. There the workmen formed themselves into a kind of committee for the purpose of daily inspecting every part of the collieries. The masters listened to and acted upon any suggestions they might make, and the result was a system of inspection incomparably superior to any other which could be devised or effected by Government. It was natural that the workmen, whose lives were constantly threatened, should look to the Government for protection from dangers, and, within proper limits, the Government ought to grant them that protection; but at the same time the workmen ought themselves to co-operate. Their occupation was attended by peculiar dangers, from which no Government could wholly exempt them. By the co-operation of the men those dangers might be much lessened; but, in the absence of such co-operation, he altogether despaired of seeing a reduction in the number of lives lost in consequence of accidents in mines. The Government ought to have in every locality a certain number of competent men to receive complaints, to examine mines which they had reason to believe to be in a dangerous condition, to listen to and to act upon every warning and rumour of danger; but it was no part of their duty to examine personally into the state of every colliery. He should only be deceiving the House and the colliers themselves if he held out on the part of the Government any promise of a largely extended system of inspection. That in other respects, however, fresh legislation might be advantageous he did not deny; and he hoped that early next Session the House would have an opportunity of re-considering the Mines Regulation Bill, amended as it would be in consequence of the suggestions he had received from the noble Lord and from other quarters, and that everything which legislation could effect would be done to promote the security of collieries.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

COMPULSORY CHURCH RATES ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. M'LAREN, Bill for the abolition of Compulsory Church Rates in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. M'LAREN and Mr. CRAUFURD.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 266.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 10*th August,* 1869.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Third Reading*—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) * (279); Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation * (294); Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan * (285); Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) * (280), and *passed.*

THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

LORD DENMAN rose to call attention to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the new Law Courts. It seemed to be supposed that the concentration of the Law Courts would be a great public advantage; but that he held to be a great mistake. The consequence of that idea was that great expense had been incurred in obtaining a new site. Notwithstanding the pledge given to Parliament that the expense of obtaining and clearing away the new site should not exceed £750,000 that had already been exceeded, and before the approaches were made the expense would amount to a good deal more. He thought they would have cause to regret it if they acted upon the principle of concentrating all the Courts into one place. It was said of the new site proposed on the bank of the river that it had "the three R's" in its favour, for it was approached by road, by river, and by rail; but he begged to say that the Courts at Guildhall were as convenient for City men, and as easily approached, as any site on the banks of the river would be. The project of concentration was advocated to save lawyers the trouble of walking far from their chambers to the Law Courts, and to allow the seniors to hold briefs in more than one court at a time—thus effectually cutting off all chance of the juniors rising. He (Lord Denman), on the other hand, thought it would be of great advantage to have causes tried in various parts of this great metropolis. This opinion, he was happy to say, was shared by an eminent Member of their Lordships' House, who had himself been at the Bar. He thought the Carey Street site was preferable to that of the restricted site on the river; but he hoped their Lordships would pause before they committed themselves to either of them.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

REPRINT OF BILL.

LORD REDESDALE moved that this Bill, as amended by the Commons, be reprinted, with a view of showing how materially it differed from the measure sent down by their Lordships, and of placing on record the proceedings of both Houses for reference in a future Session.

Motion *agreed to.*

LORD REDESDALE wished to mention, in proof that the division last night was not a party one, but was due to the determination of the House to retain its due influence in legislation, that not a single Member of the late Cabinet took part in it. He received last night a telegram from Lord Derby, who expected that the question would not have been discussed till to-day, stating his readiness and desire to come up to town that he might be present.

LORD DENMAN said, that he was ready to have stayed in London a sufficient time to consider the alterations; but, as the Prorogation was fixed for the 11th, he voted as he did. He regretted that the vigour and determination shown in the division last night had not been exhibited in reference to the Irish Church Bill. Every Irishman he had met with was unwilling to return to his home in consequence of the present aspect of affairs.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND OFFICE OF THE GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD.

Report from the Select Committee *considered* (according to order), and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, 'till To-morrow, a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 10*th August,* 1869.

CLERKS IN THE CUSTOMS.—QUESTION.

MR. WHITWELL said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. H. B. Sheridan), he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If the Government is prepared (now that the reorganization of the Customs is under the consideration of the Lords of the Treasury) to consider the case of those twenty extra clerks in the Customs Service who are at present excluded from all promotion or appointment to the "establishment" by the retrospective action of Treasury Orders issued in 1853 and 1856; and, whether the case will be considered with a view to amalgamation or establishing these extra clerks and placing them upon a footing with the established clerks with regard to pay, prospect of promotion, sick leave, and superannuation, or otherwise providing for them in some just and satisfactory manner?

MR. AYRTON said, in reply, that it appeared that sometimes extra clerks of good character had been eligible to appointments on the permanent establishment. At the same time, there was a proviso that no extra clerk should be appointed to the establishment, unless when first employed he were within the age prescribed for establishment clerks. That age was twenty-five years. It would seem that these twenty gentlemen were above the age of twenty-five when they were first employed, and could not be admitted to the establishment. His hon. Friend wished to know whether the case would be considered with a view to amalgamation or establishing these extra clerks and placing them on a footing with the established clerks with regard to pay, &c. But it was impossible to depart from the regulations adopted for the general management of the service. The extra clerks, however, appeared to have received some increase of pay; but he was afraid it was impossible to hold out to them any expectation of further consideration. Nor could they be put on the same footing with established clerks for superannuation or otherwise. It was true that the case had been inquired into by the Committee appointed some time ago to investigate the condition of the Customs; but the recommendations of that Committee had not been carried into effect, and they were the subject now of further inquiry.

ITALY—ARREST OF MR. NATHAN.

QUESTION.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the arrest of a young man, Mr. Nathan, a British subject, at Milan in April last, and to his continued incarceration to this time without trial, bail being refused; and, whether he will state what steps Her Majesty's Government have taken in the matter?

MR. OTWAY said, he had to say, in answer to the Question of his hon. Friend, that his attention had been called to the arrest of this young gentleman, Mr. Nathan, at Milan. It appeared that he was a mere boy, he believed of nineteen years of age, and the first intimation that the British Minister at Florence had of his arrest was on the 19th of July, when the brother of Mr. Nathan called at the Legation and informed Sir Augustus Paget of the circumstance. Sir Augustus Paget reported the fact to the Foreign Office on the 21st of July, and Lord Clarendon directed instructions to be sent to Sir Augustus Paget on the 3rd of August, desiring that all the information he could obtain should be forwarded, requesting that the young man might be admitted to bail, and that in the meantime he should not be sent to Naples.

NAVY—ADMIRALTY ACCOUNTS.

QUESTION.

MR. SEELY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he intends to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee on Admiralty Monies and Accounts as regards the form of the Navy Estimates, the Savings and Deficiencies, the Navy Ships' Accounts, and the Manufacturing Accounts?

MR. CHILDERS said, in reply, that it was the intention of the Admiralty to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Commons with respect to the form of the Estimates, the Savings and Deficiencies, and the Navy Ship and Manufacturing

Accounts. Next year the Estimates would be shown in the form recommended by the Committee. The Manufacturing and Ship Accounts for 1866-7, laid upon the table a few days ago, were framed generally on the principle recommended by the Committee, though they were not quite perfect.

MELTING OF ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS.

QUESTION.

Mr. SINCLAIR AYTOUN said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House Copies of any Correspondence or Papers with respect to manufactures in London, Paris, and Brussels for the melting of English sovereigns; and, if he will state whether he is in possession of any evidence that such a manufacture at present exists in Brussels?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have no Correspondence upon the subject to lay upon the table. Of course, I should not have made the statement I did unless I had strong reason to believe that such a manufacture was carried on at Brussels. The question is equivalent to asking me whether I made a statement for which I had no ground whatever. There is nothing, so far as I am aware, contrary to law in melting down sovereigns; and it seems to me that our regulations in making no charge for mintage are expressly framed to promote that practice.

Mr. SINCLAIR AYTOUN: May I be allowed to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will lay upon the table any Papers containing the evidence on the subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Certainly, the hon. Gentleman may be allowed to ask me that question, and I hope I may also be allowed to decline answering it.

NAVY—WEST COAST OF AFRICA.

QUESTION.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, What number of Vessels and of Men are at present stationed on the West Coast of Africa, and if he can now state the actual reduction he purposes making in that squadron before the close of the present year?

Mr. CHILDERS said, in reply, that on the 1st of January, a few days after he took Office, he found, upon the West Coast of Africa and at the Cape of Good Hope, sixteen ships, containing 1,806 men. When he made his statement on introducing the Navy Estimates he explained that the ships had been reduced from sixteen to fourteen, and the number of men to 1,450. Since that time the ships had been still further reduced from fourteen to thirteen, and he contemplated the reduction of another ship, and a reduction of the number of men to 1,350. Since the present Government had been in Office there had been a reduction of four ships and about 500 men in this squadron. He would repeat what he had said in answer to the hon. Member (Mr. J. Lowther), that the squadron on this coast was not employed for the suppression of the slave trade, but for the protection of our commerce, as in other parts of the world.

BRISTOL PILOTS AT FALMOUTH.

QUESTION.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, he wished to ask the Secretary of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been directed to the practice of Pilots belonging to Bristol visiting Falmouth with a view of taking charge of vessels sailing from that Port, thus interfering with the Pilots belonging to Falmouth, and frequently causing the detention of ships for want of Pilots off Lundy Island; and, whether he will consider the propriety of framing any new regulations on the subject?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, in reply, that the attention of the Board of Trade had been directed to the subject, and, after communicating with the Trinity House, they saw no necessity for interference in the matter. They were informed that vessels were not detained at Lundy Island for want of pilots.

THE THAMES EMBANKMENT AND THE METROPOLITAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

QUESTION.

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether it is true that in the event of the New Palace of Justice not being erected upon the Thames Embankment site, it is in the power of the Metropolitan Railway Company to build a station in the centre of the land reclaimed from the river; and, whether it is not the intention of the Government to secure to the public the whole of the land so reclaimed between Somerset House and the Temple for the purposes of recreation?

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that under the Act of Parliament, the Metropolitan Railway Company were empowered to build a station in the centre of the land reclaimed from the river; but should the House decide to erect the New Courts of Justice upon the Embankment site the Railway Company had in that case agreed to remove their station to a better postiion for the public—namely, at the end of Essex Street. The erection of a station in the centre of the reclaimed land would not interfere with that part of the reclaimed land which, under the Act of Parliament, would be set aside for recreation purposes.

THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE.

QUESTION.

Mr. MONK said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government intend to take any steps during the Recess in reference to the erection of the New Courts of Justice?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that any step which the Government might take must be one of two kinds. They must either give notice to acquire fresh land upon which to erect the buildings, or they must obtain a Grant from Parliament for the erection of new buildings. As to the first, the Committee had not recommended the acquisition of any fresh land, and therefore there would be no notice given of any Bill for the purpose; and as to the other course, as no Grant had been obtained from Parliament to erect these buildings upon either site, he could not see how the Government could possibly take any steps for the erection of buildings until Parliament met again.

ASSIZE SENTENCES ON CRIMINALS.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BRUCE said, he wished to say a few words in regard to a Question put to him on Friday last by the hon. Member for York (Mr. J. Lowther), in the absence of the hon. Baronet (Sir George Jenkinson), as to the inequality of sentences passed by the Judges during the present Assizes. The Notice only appeared in the Paper on the morning of the day on which his answer was given, and having had no opportunity of communicating with the learned Judges, he could give no other than a vague and general answer. He had since received communications from two of the learned Judges, and it was for the interest of public justice that the substance of these communications should be made known. One was from Mr. Justice Keating, who sentenced a man named William Rapson Oates — a herbalist, who was charged at the Bodmin Assizes with obtaining £2 5*s.* under false pretences — to five years' penal servitude, although the jury recommended the prisoner to mercy. Mr. Justice Keating stated—

> "It is quite true that the sentence was as stated, and the recommendation by the jury given. But when it appeared that the prisoner had previously been convicted twice in 1868, once for obtaining money under false pretences, four months' hard labour, and once for larceny, with nine months' hard labour, besides having been in gaol under convictions as a vagrant and for assault, one month each, in 1865 and 1866, the jury stated they wished to withdraw their recommendation, which, they said, they never would have made if they had known the facts. I may add, that after getting the £2 5*s.* from the poor prosecutrix, he endeavoured the following day to obtain £1 under the same false pretence that he was the second son of the head warder of the gaol at Bodmin, who was known to her, and on whose account she advanced the money. I considered that the public had a right to be protected against a very clever and expert swindler and thief, and passed the sentence complained of."

The other sentence was passed by Mr. Justice Mellor. The hon. Member said of it that it was the case of

> "A man named Simmons, convicted for feloniously killing his wife at Redhill. Details very revolting and brutal; guilty, but recommended to mercy; not concurred in by the Judge; sentence, five years' penal servitude."

The learned Judge wrote—

> "In the case of Simmons, charged with the manslaughter of his wife, I heard no evidence of any kick or act of violence done by the prisoner other than that of the pushing which caused her

fall. It is true the doctor stated that injuries such as he found might have been occasioned by the prisoner knocking down his wife and then kicking her; but, in answer to a question put by me, he stated that on the *post mortem* examination he found no marks or bruises which might not have been caused by her falling down stairs. The daughter of the prisoner stated that she saw him pushing her mother out at the door, but did not see her fall. In answer to questions from me, she said that there was a landing-place outside the door of the chamber, the size of which she pointed out to the jury by referring to a partition in the court. The jury were of opinion that the prisoner had no intention to push the deceased downstairs, and recommended him to mercy. I delayed to pass sentence because I did not feel sure that I rightly understood the reasons upon which the recommendation was based. Upon considering the evidence of the daughter, it appeared to me that it might afford a reasonable foundation for the recommendation, and I accordingly passed the mitigated sentence of five years' penal servitude."

The next case showed that the hon. Baronet who put the Notice on the Paper was not acquainted with the facts. His words were—

"Case 2, same Court, a man named Fyfield, convicted for feloniously cutting and wounding his wife with intent to murder her; details very bad; guilty; a bad case of unlawfully wounding; sentence, eighteen months' imprisonment."

The Judge wrote—

"With reference to Fyfield's case the question assumes that he was 'convicted of feloniously cutting and wounding his wife with intent to murder her,' whereas he was acquitted of the felony and of the intent to murder, and of the intent to do grievous bodily harm, and convicted of the misdemeanour of unlawfully wounding only. I passed upon him the sentence of eighteen months imprisonment with hard labour."

Of the third case, where it was alleged that a man who severely beat another with his fists was sentenced to fifteen years' penal servitude, the Judge said—

"In Gore's case, the indictment charged him with feloniously doing grievous bodily harm with intent to do grievous bodily harm. It appeared that under the pretence of buying a collar the prisoner went into the shop of the prosecutor, struck him behind the ear, and beat him with 'his fists' until he became insensible, remaining in that condition for many hours; spitting of blood followed, accompanied by other symptoms of so grave a character that the surgeon expressed a strong opinion that he will never recover, and will most probably speedily die as the result of the violence of the prisoner. He fainted as he left the Court. The avowed motive of the prisoner was revenge against the unfortunate prosecutor for having given evidence against him on a trial for assaulting the police. Two considerations influenced me in the sentence which I passed—in the first place, the grave and dangerous character of the violence inflicted; in the second place, the necessity of throwing such protection around witnesses who may hereafter be compelled to give evidence as a severe sentence was calculated to afford. My practice is to make a great distinction in the punishment of crimes of violence committed deliberately and with malice aforethought, and crimes of violence committed without premeditation and without malice aforethought. I endeavoured to apply this distinction in the sentences referred to; whether I succeeded or not I leave to the judgment of others."

THE GOLD COINAGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE: Sir, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has proposed for our consideration in the Recess a curious conundrum with respect to coinage, currency, and circulation. So much misapprehension prevails on the subject that I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether, in his suggestion the other evening respecting the gold coinage, he proposed that a person sending to the Mint a bar of gold, for which he now received 100 sovereigns without deduction for coining, should in future receive only 99 sovereigns of the same weight and quality as at present, the one sovereign being retained by the Mint for expenses of coinage; or whether he proposes that the same bar of gold should be coined into 101 sovereigns of less weight or quality than at present, and that the person sending the bar should receive 100 sovereigns, the remaining one being retained by the Mint for the expense of coinage. If the latter proposition were carried into effect, I wish to ask whether it would not necessarily involve the reduction of the intrinsic value of the pound sterling to be paid under existing deeds, mortgages, contracts, and other engagements, public and private, at home and abroad?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the conundrum which I proposed to the House does not involve either of the propositions. My suggestion was this—that a man, taking the words of the question, who brought to the Mint a bar of gold for which he would now receive 100 sovereigns should receive 100 sovereigns still, but that each of these sovereigns should be lighter than the present sovereign by one grain, value somewhere about 2*d*., approximating nearly to 1 per cent on the value of the sovereign. The proposal was—at least the idea was, for there was no proposal—that if this one grain were deducted from the value of each of the sovereigns issued, there would remain over and above the bar of gold brought to the Mint, after the issue of the 100 sovereigns forming its equivalent, 100 grains of gold, which the Mint would pay into the Exchequer under the head of miscellaneous income, to be applied to the general purposes of revenue. I need not, therefore, enter into the question as to the effect of the proposal in either of the hypothetical cases put by the hon. Gentleman upon contracts, mortgages, engagements, and all the other things. But as regards the practical proposition which I did make I may say one word. The hon. Gentleman asks about the intrinsic value. I do not know what "intrinsic value" means; it is an ambiguous phrase. As far as I know there is no such thing as intrinsic value. It is not an inherent quality in the substance itself which gives to it its pecuniary value; the intrinsic value, in the sense which the hon. Gentleman means, is, as I conceive relative; that is to say, measuring the value of the thing in question by the amount of labour and capital which it would take to produce it. But if the hon. Gentleman means by intrinsic value the amount of gold which the sovereign will contain, then my proposition certainly involves the reduction of the intrinsic value to the extent of one grain in 123½ grains. I will answer his Question in this way—If the sovereign be treated, not as gold, but as bullion, it will have one grain less of producing power; but if the sovereign be viewed, not as bullion, but as gold, its producing power will remain just the same as at present. And the reason is obvious. The only seller of new sovereigns is the Government; and if new sovereigns could only be acquired upon the condition of paying 1 per cent more for them than is now paid, that 1 per cent would necessarily limit the demand for sovereigns till they attained the value put upon them. As sovereigns, therefore, they would be as valuable as at present, while as bullion they would be less valuable. And that attains precisely the object I have in view, which is that the sovereign should be circulated in this country, but should not be melted or exported abroad.

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE: I wish to understand whether the person bringing the bar of gold to be coined will pay anything for coining it?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think I have answered the question before. The person bringing the bar of gold to be coined—assuming it to be worth 100 sovereigns—would have deducted from the value 100 grains of gold; and to that extent he would pay.

FOREIGN OFFICE AGENCIES.

QUESTION.

In answer to an appeal by Mr. BRUCE,

SIR HENRY BULWER, who had given notice of his intention to call attention to the state of the Foreign Office Agencies, and to propose a Resolution on the subject, said, he would consent to forego his intention. He desired, however, to obtain from his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, an assurance that the Government would propose some alterations in the present arrangements as to Foreign Office Agencies, which he regarded as exceedingly objectionable. Those arrangements had been entered into originally with the view of satisfying everybody, and had ended by satisfying nobody.

MR. OTWAY said, he regretted that his hon. Friend had been prevented by indisposition from attending on the occasion when he stated the intentions of the Secretary of State on this subject. The matter had not escaped the attention of Lord Clarendon, and a scheme was now being matured, which it was hoped would have the effect desired by his hon. Friend. The Foreign Office Agency Question had not been settled satisfactorily, and he had no hesitation in saying that before Parliament met again there would be a change.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. KINNAIRD: Sir, I wish to put a question to the Government, to know whether they are prepared to announce what course they will take next Session with regard to that important measure of Scotch Education, which has met with such a disastrous end in "another place," and on no other plea than that it was the month of August when it came before the House of Lords. I wish to ask, Whether the Government are prepared to tell us that early next Session the Bill may be re-introduced?

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Certainly the course pursued in "another place" in regard to the Bill has excited not less surprise than regret — regret on many accounts, both in regard to the measure which was the subject of that treatment, and in regard to the position between the two Houses. It certainly is unfortunate that a Bill introduced into the House of Lords at the very beginning of the Session, which was altered in a very large degree by that House, which occupied that House for three months and a-half, which came down here at a time when business was very important and very pressing—and which has been before this House only a month and a-half—should have been rejected in another place, on the ground that there was not time to consider it. This is, indeed, a very unfortunate state of affairs. The Bill was a most important one; and the very alterations which had been made in it in the House of Lords prove that it was a measure of very great difficulty, requiring serious consideration; and it required consideration more particularly in this House, where the representatives of the people—the representatives of those who have the main interest in the education of the country—were to be found. All that I can say as to the future is that one cause of the regret which we feel, as to the treatment which the Bill has received, arises from the fact that we had the discussion ground free to ourselves. We were in a position to undertake and to pass a measure for Scotland without being embarrassed with other questions. Sir, I can undertake nothing absolutely for the future. What can be done next Session must depend very much upon other important questions which will have to be considered. All I can say is, that what has been done in another place will not discourage us for future efforts, and should enable the representatives of Scotland especially to aid with even more harmony and co-operation in the accomplishment of their great object.

APPOINTMENT OF REVISING BARRISTERS.—QUESTION.

MR. CRAUFURD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department a question as to the recent appointment of Revising Barristers by the Lord Chief Baron on the Home Circuit. The senior Judge on the Summer Circuit had each year the right of appointing members of his own circuit to be Revising Barristers for the year, and therefore, theoretically, the appointment was annual, but the practice had invariably been, that except for special reasons, no change should be made in the appointments. On the last occasion, however, that practice had been departed from in one, if not in two cases. In one case the gentleman who had held the appointment before very much needed the assistance it afforded him, as he had a wife and family; but he had been displaced in favour of a young man, who was, perhaps, perfectly qualified for the office, but who had only just been elected a member of the Home Circuit. He wished to know, Whether the Home Secretary had any information on the matter; and, if not, whether the right hon. Gentleman would inquire into the reasons for pursuing such an unusual course?

MR. BRUCE, in reply, said, he had no more information than what he had stated to the House yesterday; but he should not consider it his duty to ask the Judge intrusted with the power of selecting the Revising Barristers why he had selected one in preference to another. At the same time, the young gentleman who had been referred to as having obtained one of the appointments was a barrister of more than three years' standing, as he was bound to be under the Act of Parliament.

MR. CRAUFURD: I said he had only just joined the circuit.

House adjourned at Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 11th August, 1869.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Royal Assent*— Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 93]; New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 94]; Millbank Prison [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 95]; Contagious Diseases [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 96]; Government of India Act Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 97]; Governor General of India [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 98]; Habitual Criminals [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 99]; Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c. [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 103]; Dividends on Public Stocks [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 104]; Harbour of Galle Loan [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 105]; East India Loan [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 106]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 100]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 108]; Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 107]; Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 109]; Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 101]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 102]; Charity Commissioners [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 110]; Bishops Resignation [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 111]; Seeds Adulteration [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 112]· Nitro Glycerine [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 113]; Railways Abandonment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 114]; Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 115]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 116]; Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 117]; Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. clviii.]; Inclosure of Lands [32 & 33 *Vict.* c: clix.]

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.
HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The Lords Commissioners—namely, The Lord Chancellor; The Lord Privy Seal (The Earl of Kimberley); The Earl Granville (Secretary of State for the Colonies); The Lord Chamberlain of the Household (The Viscount Sydney); and The Lord Foley—being in their robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the Commons being come, with their Speaker, the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* Her Majesty's Speech as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"We are commanded by Her Majesty to dispense with your further attendance in Parliament.

"Her Majesty announces to you with pleasure that She continues to receive from all Foreign Powers the strongest assurances of their friendly disposition, and that Her confidence in the preservation of peace has been continued and confirmed during the present year.

"The negotiations in which Her Majesty was engaged with the United States of North America have by mutual consent been suspended; and Her Majesty earnestly hopes that this delay may tend to maintain the relations between the two countries on a durable basis of friendship.

"Her Majesty has a lively satisfaction in acknowledging the untiring zeal and assiduity with which you have prosecuted the arduous labours of the year.

"In the Act for putting an end to the Establishment of the Irish Church you carefully kept in view the several considerations which, at the opening of the Session, were commended to your notice.

"It is the hope of Her Majesty that this important measure may hereafter be remembered as a conclusive proof of the paramount anxiety of Parliament to pay reasonable regard, in legislating for each of the three Kingdoms, to the special circumstances by which it may be distinguished, and to deal on principles of impartial justice with all interests and all portions of the nation.

"Her Majesty firmly trusts that the Act may promote the work of peace in Ireland, and may help to unite all classes of its people in that fraternal concord with their English and Scottish fellow subjects which must ever form the chief source of strength to Her extended Empire.

"Her Majesty has observed with pleasure your general and cordial readiness to unite in the removal, through the Assessed Rates Act, of a practical grievance which was widely felt.

"Her Majesty congratulates you on having brought your protracted labours on the subjects of Bankruptcy and of Imprisonment for Debt to a legislative conclusion which is regarded with just satisfaction by the trading classes and by the general public.

"The law which you have framed for the better government of Endowed Schools in England will render the large resources of these establishments more accessible to the community, and more efficient for their important purpose.

"It may reasonably be expected that the Act for the supervision of Habitual Criminals will contribute further to the security of life and property.

"The measure which has been passed with respect to the Contagious Diseases of Animals will, as Her Majesty believes, add confidence and safety to the important trades of breeding and feeding cattle at home, without unnecessarily impeding the freedom of import from abroad.

"By the repeal of the tax on Fire Insurance you have met a long-cherished wish of the community; and in the removal of the duty on Corn Her Majesty sees new evidence of your desire to extend industry and commerce, and to enlarge to the uttermost those supplies of food which our insular position in a peculiar degree both encourages and requires.

"Her Majesty trusts that the measure for the purchase and management of the Electric Telegraphs by the State may be found to facilitate the great commercial and social object of rapid, easy, and certain communication, and may prove no unworthy sequel to that system of cheap postage which has passed with much advantage into so many countries of the civilized world.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"We are commanded to state that Her Majesty thanks you for the liberal supplies which you have granted for the service of the year, and for the measures by which you have enabled Her at once to liquidate the charge of the Abyssinian Expedition.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"Her Majesty reflects with pleasure that, in returning to your several homes, you may contemplate with thankfulness the fruit of your exertions in the passing of many important laws, a portion of which we have now had it in command to notice.

"During the recess you will continue to gather that practical knowledge and experience which form the solid basis of legislative aptitude; and Her Majesty invokes the blessing of the Almighty alike upon your recent and your future labours for the public weal.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Thursday the 28th day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Thursday the 28th day of October next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 11th August, 1869.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

APPOINTMENT OF REVISING BARRISTERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. WEST said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government intend to introduce a measure next Session, in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee on Registration, and which would have the effect of relieving the Judges having the Summer Assize Circuits from the appointment of the Revising Barristers?

Mr. BRUCE said, in reply, that the subject was under the consideration of the Government. The recommendations of the Select Committee were alternative, and it was impossible to say, if the Government should propose to alter the present system of making the appointment, which of these alternative propositions they would adopt.

LICENSES ON CABS AND OMNIBUSES. QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will, before fixing the sum to be paid by the owners of omnibuses and cabs for the new Police Regulation Licenses, consider the arrangement existing in provincial towns, and so adapt the charges that the burden of local taxation may not fall heavier on the owners of public vehicles in the metropolis than in other places, the Secretary of State being empowered by the present Metropolitan Act to fix £2 2*s*. as the license on each public carriage, which in other places was only 10*s*. per annum?

Mr. BRUCE said, in reply, that the last thing he should wish to do was to intercept any portion of the benefit which would accrue both to the owners of vehicles and the public from the diminution of the duties upon public vehicles. The charges for inspection, which had amounted to about £13,000 a year, had hitherto been borne partly by the Imperial revenue and partly by the metropolitan police rate. It was stipulated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this charge for inspection should be levied on the vehicles themselves. It was his desire that this charge should be as low as was consistent with effective supervision. An inquiry was now going on in all the provincial towns as to the cost of supervision, but whether he should be able to reduce the charge to the level of the sum found sufficient in provincial towns he did not know.

BURGLARIES AT STAINES.—QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY said, he would beg to inquire, Whether the attention of the authorities of the Home Office has been drawn to the commission of a succession of burglaries, seven having taken place within the fifteen days preceding this notice at Staines and the immediate neighbourhood?

Mr. BRUCE said, it was not quite accurate to say that seven burglaries had occurred within fifteen days in and about Staines. There had been two burglaries and three larcenies by stealing out of houses in the day time, in consequence of the windows being left open. The value of the property taken in one case was only 2*s*. 6*d*. In consequence of the burglaries two mounted policemen and one detective had been sent into the neighbourhood.

JAMAICA CLERGY ACT.—QUESTION.

Mr. M'ARTHUR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What course the Government intend to take in relation to the Jamaica Clergy Act, which would shortly expire, and what are their intentions in reference to the future ecclesiastical arrangements for that island?

Mr. MONSELL said, in reply, that the Jamaica Clergy Act would expire this year. Under that Act more than £20,000, raised out of the taxes of the colony, was appropriated to religious purposes. By the Census of 1861 it appeared that there were in Jamaica 40,000 members of the Anglican Church 42,000 Methodists, 51,530 Baptists, and 30,000 belonging to other religious denominations. Of this sum of £20,000, all, except £370, went towards the maintenance of the Church of England. Under these circumstances it had been determined to introduce religious equality into that colony, and instructions had been issued to the Governor to the effect that Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that the moral and religious culture of the subject-race of the island, and not the ascendancy of any one portion of the community, should be the object of the Government, and that it would be desirable to avoid all appearance of showing exclusive favour to any one denomination. No scheme had yet been submitted by the Governor, but one was expected to arrive by the next mail, and it would be founded on the principle just mentioned.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went;—and the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

And afterwards Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The LORD CHANCELLOR, in pursuance of Her Majesty's Commands.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Thursday the 28th day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Thursday the 28th day of October next.

[TABLE OF STATUTES.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1868-9.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 2 August 1869;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1868-9, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and the Day of the Week, the Hour of Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of The House, and the Average Time; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.109, of Session 1867-8)."

(*Mr. Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
1868									
Dec. 10	Th	2	3	0	1	0	-	-	6
„ 11	F	2	5	15	3	15	-	-	5
„ 12	S	2	3	30	1	30	-	-	2
„ 14	M	2	4	0	2	0	-	-	2
„ 15	Tu	2	3	30	1	30	-	-	27
„ 29	Tu	1	1	45	0	45	-	-	15
Total...	6	- -	-	-	10	0	-	-	57
1869									
Feb. 16	Tu	1¾	7	45	6	0	-	-	82
„ 17	W	12	1	0	1	0	-	-	104
„ 18	Th	4	6	0	2	0	-	-	146
„ 19	F	4	6	30	2	30	-	-	83
„ 22	M	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	92
„ 23	Tu	4	11	15	7	15	-	-	97
„ 24	W	12	12	45	0	45	-	-	50
„ 25	Th	4	6	15	2	15	-	-	74
„ 26	F	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	55
Total...	9	- -	-	-	30	0	-	-	783
Mar. 1	M	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	77
„ 2	Tu	4	9	30	5	30	-	-	82
„ 3	W	12	5	30	5	30	-	-	66
„ 4	Th	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	56
„ 5	F	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	40
„ 8	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	70
„ 9	Tu	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	56
„ 10	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	36
„ 11	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	68
„ 12	F	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	59
„ 15	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	75
„ 16	Tu	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	87
„ 17	W	12	5	53	5	53	-	-	48
„ 18	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	76
„ 19	F	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	75
„ 22	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	82
„ 23	Tu	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	90
Total...	17	- -	-	-	128	58	12	45	1,143
1869									
Apr. 1	Th	4	6	15	2	15	-	-	70
„ 2	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	66
„ 5	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	73
„ 6	Tu	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	94
„ 7	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	64
„ 8	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	85
„ 9	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	76
„ 12	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	84
„ 13	Tu	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	79
„ 14	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	60
„ 15	Th	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	79
„ 16	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	96
„ 19	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	87
„ 20	Tu	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	83
„ 21	W	12	5	0	5	0	-	-	59
„ 22	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	86
„ 23	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	84
„ 26	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	117
„ 27	Tu	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	82
„ 28	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	41
„ 29	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	106
„ 30	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	75
Total...	22	- -	-	-	181	5	20	45	1,746
May 3	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	95
„ 4	Tu	2	1	0	11	0	1	0	98
„ 5	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	52
„ 6	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	85
„ 7	F	2	9	0	7	0	-	-	66
„ 10	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	109
„ 11	Tu	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	68
„ 12	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	55
„ 13	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	161
„ 27	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	93
„ 28	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	69
„ 31	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	108
Total...	12	- -	-	-	104	40	12	0	1,059

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
1869									
June 1	Tu	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	114
„ 3	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	98
„ 4	F	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	54
„ 7	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	105
„ 8	Tu	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	75
„ 9	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	52
„ 10	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	108
„ 11	F	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	76
„ 14	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	106
„ 15	Tu	2	10	15	8	15	-	-	41
„ 16	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	53
„ 17	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	77
„ 18	F	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	54
„ 21	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	86
„ 22	Tu	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	76
„ 23	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	57
„ 24	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	76
„ 25	F	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	54
„ 28	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	80
„ 29	T	2	2	45	12	45	2	45	67
„ 30	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	45
Total...	21	- -	-	-	195	35	27	30	1,554
July 1	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	77
„ 2	F	2	9	0	7	0	-	-	41
„ 5	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	89
„ 6	Tu	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	72
„ 7	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	62
„ 8	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	90
„ 9	F	2	2	0	12	0	2	0	65
cont.									
July 12	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	86
„ 13	Tu	2	2	45	12	45	2	45	49
„ 14	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	36
„ 15	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	69
„ 16	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	53
„ 19	M	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	80
„ 20	Tu	2	2	30	12	30	2	30	67
„ 21	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	42
„ 22	Th	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	84
„ 23	F	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	48
„ 26	M	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	93
„ 27	Tu	2	9	10	7	10	-	-	48
„ 28	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	59
„ 29	Th	4	3	30	11	30	3	30	87
„ 30	F	2	2	45	12	45	2	45	84
„ 31	S	12	3	45	3	45	-	-	22
Total...	23	- -	-	-	219	55	38	30	1,503
Aug. 2	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	69
„ 3	Tu	2	3	30	13	30	3	30	74
„ 4	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	58
„ 5	Th	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	77
„ 6	F	2	3	45	13	45	3	45	59
„ 7	S	12	2	30	2	30	-	-	22
„ 9	M	3	7	15	4	15	-	-	70
„ 10	Tu	3	4	0	1	0	-	-	42
„ 11	W	1½	Prorogation.				-	-	32
Total ...	9	- -	-	-	62	30	12	45	503

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
		H.	M.	H.	M.	
1868 December ...	6	10	0	-	-	57
1869 February......	9	30	0	-	-	783
March........	17	128	58	12	45	1,142
April	22	181	5	20	45	1,747
May	12	104	40	12	0	1,064
June............	21	195	35	27	30	1,554
July	23	219	55	38	30	1,503
August.........	9	62	30	12	45	503
Total......	119	932	43	124	15	8,353

Average Time of Sitting, 7 Hours 50 Minutes $\frac{33}{119}$.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1868-9.

(PARL. PAPER 0·100.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	91
Ditto „ „ „ after Midnight	61
Ditto—Private Business	8
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1868-9	160

A
TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES
PASSED IN THE FIRST SESSION OF
THE TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

32 & 33 VICTORIA.—A.D. 1869.

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

1. AN Act to apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, and one thousand eight hundred and seventy.
2. An Act for repealing the Act of the session of the eighth and ninth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter one hundred and twenty-two.
3. An Act to enable Lord Napier of Magdala to receive the full benefit of the Salary of Member of Council for the Presidency of Bombay, or as holding any other office in India, notwithstanding his being in receipt of an Annuity granted to him under the Act thirty-one and thirty-two Victoria, chapter ninety-one.
4. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better payment of the Army and their Quarters.
5. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.
6. An Act to repeal so much of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1868, as relates to the approval by meetings of incorporated railway companies of bills and certificates for conferring further powers on those companies.
7. An Act for the confirmation and execution of arrangements made between the Secretary of State in Council of India and the East India Irrigation and Canal Company; and for other purposes connected therewith.
8. An Act to apply the sum of seventeen million one hundred thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy.
9. An Act to amend "The Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts continuing the temporary provisions of the same.
10. An Act for authorizing the removal of Prisoners from one Colony to another for the purposes of Punishment.
11. An Act for amending the Law relating to the Coasting Trade and Merchant Shipping in British Possessions.
12. An Act for Protection of Naval Stores.
13. An Act for amending the Law relating to the Militia.
14. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, and to repeal and alter other Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue.
15. An Act to remove doubts as to the qualification of persons holding Civil Service Pensions, or receiving Superannuation Allowances, to sit in Parliament.
16. An Act to amend so much of the Act of the session of the sixth and seventh years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter thirty-five, as provides that Norfolk Island is to be part of the diocese of Tasmania.
17. An Act for the Preservation of Sea Birds.
18. An Act to amend the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act.
19. An Act for amending the law relating to Mining Partnerships within the Stannaries of Devon and Cornwall, and to the Court of the Vice-Warden of the Stannaries.

20. An Act to remove doubts as to the validity of certain Statutes made by the Convocation of the University of Oxford.
21. An Act to amend the law relating to the Payment of the Expenses of Commissioners of Inquiry into Corrupt Practices at Elections of members to serve in Parliament.
22. An Act for raising the sum of two million three hundred thousand pounds by Exchequer Bonds for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy.
23. An Act to extend the Power of Recorders to appoint Deputies in certain cases.
24. An Act to repeal certain enactments relating to Newspapers, Pamphlets, and other Publications, and to Printers, Typefounders, and Reading Rooms.
25. An Act to amend the Act of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth years of Victoria, chapter eighty-three, section nine, by extending the age at which orphan and deserted children may be kept out at nurse.
26. An Act to extend to Burial Grounds the Provisions of the Act of the thirteenth and fourteenth years of Her Majesty, chapter twenty-eight, intituled "An Act to render more simple "and effectual the Titles by which Congrega-"tions and Societies for Purposes of Religious "Worship or Education in England and Ireland "hold Property for such Purposes."
27. An Act to amend the law for licensing Beerhouses, and to make certain alterations with respect to the Sale by retail of Beer, Cider, and Wine.
28. An Act to afford facilities for the Establishment and Maintenance of public Parks in Ireland.
29. An Act to render valid certain Title Deeds for Inam Lands.
30. An Act to legalize certain Marriages celebrated at Park Gate Chapel, and to change the name of the District Chapelry annexed to the Chapel of Cowgill.
31. An Act to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Langston, and to amend the forty-fifth section of The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868.
32. An Act to provide for the Commutation of Pensions payable to officers and other persons out of the sums voted by Parliament to defray the charges of the army and navy services.
33. An Act to provide for the Collection of Judicial Statistics in Scotland.
34. An Act to amend the Law concerning the appointment of Deputies by Stipendiary Magistrates.
35. An Act to amend "The Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act, 1860."
36. An Act to amend the Court of Session Act, 1868, in so far as the exemption of Lighthouse Keepers and their assistants from serving on Juries is thereby abolished.
37. An Act to authorize the appointment of District Prothonotaries of the Court of Common Pleas of the county palatine of Lancaster, and to provide for the better despatch of business therein.
38. An Act to facilitate the taking Special Bails in Civil Proceedings depending in the Superior Courts of Law at Westminster, and in Proceedings in Error and on Appeal.
39. An Act to make provision for the better government and administration of Hospitals and other endowed institutions in Scotland.
40. An Act to exempt from rating Sunday and Ragged Schools.
41. An Act for amending the Law with respect to the rating of Occupiers for short terms, and the making and collecting of the Poor's Rate.
42. An Act to put an end to the Establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make provision in respect of the Temporalities thereof, and in respect of the Royal College of Maynooth.
43. An Act to provide for the payment of Diplomatic Salaries, Allowances, and Pensions.
44. An Act to make better provision respecting Greenwich Hospital, and the application of the revenues thereof.
45. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Repayment of Loans to Poor Law Unions.
46. An Act to abolish the distinction as to priority of payment which now exists between the specialty and simple contract debts of deceased persons.
47. An Act to provide for the discharge of the duties heretofore performed by High Constables, and for the abolition of such office, with certain exceptions.
48. An Act to amend The Companies Clauses Act, 1863.
49. An Act to enable Local Authorities to collect Fines and Fees by means of Stamps.
50. An Act to provide for Superannuation Allowances to Medical Officers of poor law unions, and of dispensary districts of such unions, in Ireland.
51. An Act to amend the County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act, 1868, and to give Jurisdiction in certain Maritime Causes.
52. An Act for the Amendment of "The Shipping Dues Exemption Act, 1867."
53. An Act to amend the Cinque Ports Act.
54. An Act to amend the Act of the first and second years of Victoria, chapter fifty-six, intituled "An Act for the more effectual Relief of the destitute Poor in Ireland."
55. An Act to shorten the Term of Residence required as a Qualification for the Municipal Franchise, and to make provision for other purposes.
56. An Act to amend the Law relating to Endowed Schools and other Educational Endowments in England, and otherwise to provide for the Advancement of Education.
57. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Protection of Seamen's Clothing and Property.
58. An Act for amending the Public Schools Act, 1868.
59. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Investments for Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks.
60. An Act to alter and amend the Acts enabling Her Majesty to grant Pensions to persons having held certain high civil offices.
61. An Act to protect the Funds of Trades Unions from Embezzlement and Misappropriation.
62. An Act for the Abolition of Imprisonment for Debt, for the punishment of fraudulent debtors, and for other purposes.
63. An Act to amend The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867.
64. An Act to appoint additional Commissioners for executing the Acts for granting a Land Tax and other rates and taxes.

65. An Act for appointing Commissioners to inquire into the existence of corrupt Practices amongst the Freemen Electors of the city of Dublin.

66. An Act to continue and amend an Act to defray the charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other expenses of the Disembodied Militia in Great Britain and Ireland; to grant allowances in certain cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia; and to authorize the employment of the Non-commissioned Officers.

67. An Act to provide for Uniformity in the Assessment of Rateable Property in the Metropolis.

68. An Act for the further Amendment of the Law of Evidence.

69. An Act to provide for the better Liquidation of certain Loans raised under the guarantee of Her Majesty for the service of the colony of Jamaica.

70. An Act to consolidate, amend, and make perpetual the Acts for preventing the introduction or spreading of Contagious or Infectious Diseases among Cattle and other Animals in Great Britain.

71. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law of Bankruptcy.

72. An Act to amend "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and to afford further facilities for the purposes thereof.

73. An Act to alter and amend "The Telegraph Act, 1868."

74. An Act to extend the period for the Repayment of Advances of Public Money for the construction of certain Public Works in Ireland, and also to incorporate the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland for certain purposes, and to vest in the said Commissioners lands and premises held on public trusts.

75. An Act to regulate and extend the Jurisdiction of Her Majesty's Consul at Zanzibar in regard to vessels captured on suspicion of being engaged in the Slave Trade, and for other purposes relating thereto.

76. An Act for providing the final sum necessary to be raised by loan towards carrying on the works now in course of construction for the protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Harbours of Dover and Portland, and for authorizing the abandonment of that portion of the works already sanctioned by Parliament which has not been yet commenced.

77. An Act for making better provision for the erection of a Lighthouse on the Great Basses Rock in the Colony of Ceylon, and for other purposes connected therewith.

78. An Act to amend the Law relating to Criminal Lunatics.

79. An Act to enable Corporate and other Public Bodies in Ireland to grant Superannuation Allowances to Officers in their Service in certain cases.

80. An Act to amend "The Militia (Ireland) Act, 1854," as to providing houses or places for the keeping of the arms, accoutrements, clothing, or other stores of the Militia when not embodied.

81. An Act to amend the Volunteer Act, 1863.

82. An Act to amend the Metropolitan Building Act, 1855.

83. An Act to provide for the winding-up of the business of the late Court for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England, and to repeal Enactments relating to Insolvency, Bankruptcy, Imprisonment for Debt, and matters connected therewith.

84. An Act to abolish the office of Cursitor of the Court of Chancery in the palatine of Durham.

85. An Act to continue various expiring Laws.

86. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Presentation of Accounts, Statements, Returns, and Documents to Parliament.

87. An Act to provide for the prevention of Gaming in public places in Scotland.

88. An Act for the separation of the Straits Settlements from the Diocese of Calcutta.

89. An Act to amend the Law relating to the office of Clerk of Assize and offices united thereto, and to certain Fees upon Orders for payment of witnesses in criminal proceedings.

90. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts, and to make further Provisions concerning Turnpike Roads.

91. An Act for amending the Law relating to the Salaries, Expenses, and Funds of Courts of Law in England.

92. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Fisheries of Ireland.

93. An Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

94. An Act to amend the New Parishes Acts and Church Building Acts.

95. An Act to enable Military Offenders to be confined in Millbank Prison.

96. An Act to amend the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866.

97. An Act to amend in certain respects the Act for the better Government of India.

98. An Act to define the powers of the Governor General of India in Council at meetings for making laws and regulations for certain purposes.

99. An Act for the more effectual Prevention of Crime.

100. An Act to facilitate the borrowing money in certain cases for the purpose of The Sanitary Act, 1866, and the Acts amending the same; and for other purposes.

101. An Act for authorizing a guarantee of a loan to be raised by Canada for a payment in respect of the transfer of Rupert's Land.

102. An Act for making further provision respecting the borrowing of Money by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and for other purposes connected therewith.

103. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Warehousing of Wines and Spirits in Customs and Excise Warehouses, and for other purposes relating to Customs and Inland Revenue.

104. An Act for facilitating the Payment of Dividends on the Public Stocks, and for making regulations with respect thereto.

105. An Act for empowering the Public Works Loan Commissioners to advance a sum not exceeding two hundred and fifty thousand pounds for the improvement of the harbour of Galle in the colony of Ceylon.

106. An Act to enable the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise Money in the United Kingdom for the Service of the Government of India.
107. An Act to amend The Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866.
108. An Act to amend "The Sanitary Act, 1866," so far as the same relates to Ireland.
109. An Act for repealing part of an Act of the first year of the reign of their Majesties King William and Queen Mary, intituled "An Act "to vest in the two Universities the presenta-"tions of benefices belonging to Papists," and for securing uniformity in the law relating to the residence of spiritual persons upon their benefices, and to the penalties and forfeitures consequent on non-residence.
110. An Act for amending the Charitable Trusts Acts.
111. An Act for the relief of Archbishops and Bishops when incapacitated by infirmity.
112. An Act to prevent the Adulteration of Seeds.
113. An Act to prohibit for a limited period the importation, and to restrict and regulate the carriage, of Nitro Glycerine.
114. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Abandonment of Railways and the Dissolution of Railway Companies.
115. An Act for amending the Law relating to Hackney and Stage Carriages within the Metropolitan Police District.
116. An Act to amend "The Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act, 1868."
117. An Act to amend "The Pharmacy Act, 1868."

The Acts contained in the following List, being Public Acts of a Local Character, are placed amongst the Local and Personal Acts.

lix. An Act to confirm a scheme under "The Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866."
lx. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.
lxx. An Act to confirm certain Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Donibristle (Firth of Forth) and the Holy Loch (Firth of Clyde).
lxxi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Clifftonville, Gillingham, Rosslare, Saint Just, Fowey, and Padstow.
cxxiii. An Act to confirm three Provisional Orders made by the Poor Law Board under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, with reference to the city of Chester, the incorporated hundreds of Tunstead and Happing in the county of Norfolk, and the parish of Woolavington in the county of Sussex.
cxxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the districts of Bideford, Bournemouth, Bowness, Bristol, Croydon (2), Fleetwood, Hanley, Harrowgate, Litchurch, Litherland, Portsmouth, Lochdale, Ryde, and Worthing; and for other purposes relative to certain districts under that Act.
cxlix. An Act to confirm Provisional Orders under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.
cl. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the districts of Aberystwith, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bath, Cleckheaton, Crompton, Newport (Monmouthshire), Reading, Southport, Stalybridge, and Weston-super-Mare.
clviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Broughty Ferry.
clix. An Act to authorize the inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of a report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales.

LOCAL AND PRIVATE ACTS.

The Titles to which the Letter **P.** *is prefixed are Public Acts of a Local Character.*

i. AN Act to enable the Company of Proprietors of the West Middlesex Waterworks to raise a further sum of money; and for other purposes.

ii. An Act for better supplying with Water Brymbo and places adjacent in the county of Denbigh.

iii. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the London Necropolis and National Mausoleum Company; and for other purposes.

iv. An Act to authorize the Company of Proprietors of Lambeth Waterworks to raise further Money; and for other purposes.

v. An Act for making a Railway from the East Lincolnshire line of the Great Northern Railway at Firsby to the town of Wainfleet All Saints, in the parts of Lindsey in the county of Lincoln; and for other purposes.

vi. An Act to enable the Crystal Palace Company to grant leases of certain portions of their land.

vii. An Act to alter and enlarge some of the powers of the Rock Life Assurance Company, and for other purposes.

viii. An Act for altering the vestry of the parish of Saint Giles Without Cripplegate within the liberties of the city of London, and for other purposes.

ix. An Act to amend "The Redheugh Bridge Act, 1866."

x. An Act to confer powers upon the Corporation of Grimsby as to the West Marshes, and the construction of a bridge over the Old Dock, and of other works at Grimsby; and for other purposes.

xi. An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Leeds to improve the streets and becks, and to make other improvements in the said borough; and for other purposes.

xii. An Act for making better provision for the repair and improvement of Great Tower Hill; and for other purposes.

xiii. An Act to confirm a Working Agreement between the Dublin and Meath Railway Company and the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company; and for other purposes.

xiv. An Act to transfer the Harbour of Workington from the trustees thereof to the Right Honourable William Earl of Lonsdale; to authorize the improvement and extension of that harbour; and for other purposes.

xv. An Act for dissolving the Ilkley Gas Company (Limited) and re-incorporating the proprietors therein with others, and to give them further powers for supplying gas to Ilkley and the neighbourhood in the West Riding of the county of York; and for other purposes.

xvi. An Act to subdivide the shares of the Imperial (Fire) Insurance Company, and for other purposes with respect to the future management of the same Company.

xvii. An Act to sanction certain proceedings of the Harrogate Waterworks Company with reference to the construction of works and the raising of money, and to empower them to construct additional works and to raise further money; and for other purposes.

xviii. An Act to consolidate, define, and regulate the Capital of the South Devon Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xix. An Act for making provision for the execution of the London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Act, 1868, as far as it relates to the freeing from Toll of the following Bridges on the Thames; namely, Kew, Kingston-upon-Thames, Hampton Court, Walton-upon-Thames, and Staines; and Chingford Bridge and Tottenham Mills Bridges on the Lee; and for other purposes.

xx. An Act for authorizing the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London to raise a further sum of Money for the completion of the Holborn Valley Viaduct, and the streets and works connected therewith.

xxi. An Act for making a railway from the Great Southern and Western Railway in the parish of Fermoy in the county of Cork to Lismore in the county of Waterford; and for other purposes.

xxii. An Act to enable the West-Ham Gas Company to increase their Capital, and for other purposes with respect to the same Company.

xxiii. An Act to alter the constitution of University College, London, and for other purposes relating to the said College.

xxiv. An Act to enable the Parochial Board of the Parish of Edinburgh, and the Trustees of the Estate of Craiglockhart for behoof of said board, to obtain from the Edinburgh Water Company a supply of Water for the New Poorhouse, and other buildings in connexion therewith, erected or to be erected on the lands of Craiglockhart.

xxv. An Act for dissolving the Manchester and Stockport Railway Company, and transferring their undertaking to the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire and Midland Railway Companies jointly; and for empowering the two last-mentioned companies jointly to make a short branch railway out of the Stockport and Woodley Junction Railway; and for authorizing a joint ownership by those two companies of the Newton and Compstall Railway and the Marple New Mills and Hayfield Junction Railway; and for granting running powers to the Midland Railway Company over parts of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway; and for other purposes.

xxvi. An Act to enable the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company to acquire additional lands at Great Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln.

xxvii. An Act for empowering the Local Board of Melton Mowbray, in the county of Leicester, to provide a Cattle Market; and for conferring other powers on the Local Board; and for other purposes.

xxviii. An Act to authorize the Kent Coast Railway Company to provide for the payment of their mortgages by means of redeemable debenture stock.

xxix. An Act for effecting an Arrangement with respect to the mortgage and other Debts of the Enniskillen, Bundoran, and Sligo Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xxx. An Act to make provision respecting the use of Subways under the management of the Commissioners of Sewers of the City of London and the liberties thereof; and for other purposes.

xxxi. An Act to authorize the Great Yarmouth Waterworks Company to raise more Money, and for the Prevention of Waste and Misuse of the Company's Water; and for other purposes.

xxxii. An Act for authorizing the Water Trust of Greenock to raise further Money; and for amending the provisions of the Acts relating to the Trust; and for other purposes.

xxxiii. An Act for authorizing the Dumbarton Water Commissioners to make and maintain an additional storage reservoir and other works, and to give an increased supply of water; for dividing the Burgh of Dumbarton into wards; and for other purposes.

xxxiv. An Act to enable the West Somerset Mineral Railway Company to enter into a working agreement with and to grant a lease of their undertaking to the Ebbw Vale Steel Iron and Coal Company, limited; and for other purposes connected with their undertaking.

xxxv. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands and for the completion of the Hounslow and Metropolitan Railway.

xxxvi. An Act for incorporating and granting further powers to the Cleckheaton Gas Company.

xxxvii. An Act to authorize "The Radcliffe and Pilkington Gas Company" to raise further monies by shares and by borrowing.

xxxviii. An Act for enlarging the powers of the Consett Waterworks Company.

xxxix. An Act for better supplying with Gas the parish of Waltham Holy Cross in the county of Essex and the parish of Cheshunt in the county of Hertford; and for other purposes.

xl. An Act to authorize the King's Lynn Docks and Railway Company to connect their undertaking with the railways at King's Lynn, to change the name of the company, and for other purposes with relation to the company.

xli. An Act for altering and enlarging the powers of the Launceston and South Devon Railway Company for raising money, and for vesting their undertaking in the South Devon Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xlii. An Act for incorporating the Shotley Bridge and Consett District Gas Company; for enabling them to supply gas to parts of the parishes of Lanchester in the county of Durham, and Shotley in the county of Northumberland; and for other purposes.

xliii. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Darwen Waterworks and Reservoirs Company, and for enabling them to execute additional works and raise further capital; and for other purposes.

xliv. An Act to extend the time limited for the completion of the Bridge and other works authorized by "The Albert Bridge Act, 1864," and for other purposes.

xlv. An Act to provide for the disposition of the Workhouse Fund of the parish of Saint Martin-in-the-Fields in the county of Middlesex.

xlvi. An Act to incorporate Commissioners, and to vest in them the undertaking of the Dundee Water Company; and for other purposes.

xlvii. An Act for making a Railway from Stony Stratford in the county of Buckingham to the Wolverton station of the London and North-western Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xlviii. An Act to vest the Glasgow, Paisley, and Johnstone Canal in the Glasgow and South-western Railway Company, and to enable that company to guarantee the payment of dividends upon a portion of the share capital of the Greenock and Ayrshire Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xlix. An Act for supplying with water the townships of Undermillbeck, Applethwaite, and Troutbeck in the parish of Windermere in the county of Westmorland, and for conferring powers for that purpose on the Windermere District Gas Company; and for other purposes.

l. An Act for supplying Bishops Stortford in the county of Hertford with water.

li. An Act for better supplying with Gas and Water the town of Bridgend and neighbourhood in the county of Glamorgan, and for other purposes.

lii. An Act to enable the Midland Great Western Railway (of Ireland) Company to raise further Monies by borrowing.

liii. An Act for extending the time for the compulsory purchase of lands for, and for the completion of the authorized Railway of the London and South-western Railway Company from Bideford to Great Torrington.

liv. An Act to alter and extend the powers of the Accrington Gas and Waterworks Company in relation to their Waterworks; and for other purposes.

lv. An Act to enable the Spalding Waterworks Company to extend their works; and for other purposes with relation to the same company.

lvi. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands and for the construction of the works authorized by "The Lymington Harbour and Docks Act, 1864."

lvii. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands and for the construction of the works authorized by The Medway Docks Act, 1866.

lviii. An Act to transfer to and vest in the Corporation of Glasgow the undertakings of the Glasgow Gaslight Company and the City and

Suburban Gas Company of Glasgow, and for other purposes.

P. lix. An Act to confirm a scheme under "The Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866."

P. lx. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

lxi. An Act for abandonment of the extension railways authorized by the Llynvi Valley Railway Act, 1866, and for extension of the times limited for purchase of lands and completion of works under that Act and the Ogmore Valley Railways Act, 1866, and for making better provision for application of capital and payment of debts of the Llynvi and Ogmore Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxii. An Act to grant further powers to the Metropolitan District Railway Company.

lxiii. An Act to confer further powers upon the Great Western and the Bristol and Exeter Railway Companies with respect to the Bristol Harbour Railway and Depôt, and for other purposes.

lxiv. An Act to incorporate a Company to be called "The Barnstaple Gas Company;" to provide for the lighting of the town and parish of Barnstaple and adjoining places; and for other purposes.

lxv. An Act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the river Crouch in Essex, to be called "The Cricksea Bridge."

lxvi. An Act to authorize the Local Board of Oswaldtwistle, in the parish of Whalley, in the county of Lancaster to make and supply Gas, and to confer various powers upon the said Local Board in reference to gas, water, and street improvements; and for other purposes.

lxvii. An Act for discontinuing the Chapelry District or new Parish of All Saints, Bishopsgate, in the city of London, as a separate district; for authorizing the appropriation of certain land in that district (provided by the Great Eastern Railway Company for a new Church in substitution of the existing Church), as sites for a Curate's Residence for the parish of Saint Botolph Without, Bishopsgate, and for Schools in lieu of the present Bishopsgate Ward Schools, and for a School Chapel; and for the regulation and management of such new Schools and School Chapel, and for authorizing certain monies to be applied in building the same; and for other purposes.

lxviii. An Act for conferring further powers upon the Pontefract Park Trustees and the Pontefract Street Commissioners respectively.

lxix. An Act to extend the Edgware, Highgate, and London Railway to Harrow.

P. lxx. An Act to confirm certain Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Donibristle (Firth of Forth), and the Holy Loch (Firth of Clyde).

P. lxxi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Cliftonville, Gillingham, Rosslare, Saint Just, Fowey, and Padstow.

lxxii. An Act for the amalgamation of the Surrey and Sussex Junction Railway Company with the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxiii. An Act for the better regulation of the Harbour of Porthleven in Mount's Bay in the county of Cornwall, and for other purposes.

lxxiv. An Act for extending the boundaries of the Borough of Stockton, and for consolidating and amending the Acts in force in the Borough in relation to the management and improvement of Streets, and to Sewerage, and to Buildings, and to Police and other matters of local government; and for other purposes.

lxxv. An Act for conferring further power on the Buckfastleigh, Totnes, and South Devon Railway Company with reference to their authorized capital.

lxxvi. An Act to enlarge the powers of the Llanelly Railway and Dock Company, and for other purposes.

lxxvii. An Act to authorize the sale of Saint James' Chapel, Hampstead Road, and the utilization of the residue of the property adjoining thereto, for the benefit of the parish of Saint James', Westminster; and for other purposes.

lxxviii. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands for and for the construction of certain branch railways authorized by the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (West Riding Branches, &c.) Act, 1866; to authorize the abandonment of a junction railway authorized by that Act; to confer further powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway and the London and North-western Railway Companies with respect to certain undertakings vested in them jointly; and for other purposes.

lxxix. An Act to amend the "Ross Improvement Act, 1865."

lxxx. An Act for authorizing the Scinde Railway Company to amalgamate their several undertakings, and to make further agreements with the Secretary of State in Council of India; and for other purposes.

lxxxi. An Act to confer further powers on the City of Glasgow Union Railway Company, the Glasgow and South-western Railway Company, and the North British Railway Company.

lxxxii. An Act for amending the Hartlepool Port and Harbour Act, 1855; for abandoning part of the works by that Act authorized; for the construction of other works; for the improvement and regulation of the Port and Harbour of Hartlepool; and for other purposes.

lxxxiii. An Act for conferring additional powers on the Midland Railway Company for the construction of new works; for extending the periods for the purchase of certain lands and for the construction of certain authorized railways; and for other purposes.

lxxxiv. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Proprietors of "The Maryport Gaslight Company (Limited);" and for other purposes.

lxxxv. An Act for the formation and improvement of Clontarf Township, comprising the Districts of Clontarf, Dollymount, and Ballybough, in the Barony of Coolock and county of Dublin.

lxxxvi. An Act for conferring further powers upon and for amending the Acts relating to the London and South-western Railway Company.

lxxxvii. An Act to confer further powers upon the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Preston as a Municipal Corporation, and also as the Local Board of Health.

lxxxviii. An Act for re-incorporating and giving additional powers to the Brighton Aquarium Company, and for other purposes.

lxxxix. An Act to authorize the Great Eastern Railway Company to abandon the construction of certain railways and to purchase lands for station purposes; also to enact certain provisions with respect to the Great Eastern Metropolitan Undertaking; and for other purposes.

xc. An Act for making better provision for the cure of souls within the original limits of the parish of Saint Mary, Newington, in the diocese of London.

xci. An Act for making a railway from the Great Western (South Wales) Railway near Whitland to Crymmych Arms in the county of Pembroke.

xcii. An Act to extend the time for the completion of the East Norfolk Railway, and for other purposes.

xciii. An Act for the abandonment of the railways authorized by "The Southsea Railway Act, 1867," and for other purposes.

xciv. An Act to authorize the construction of Street Tramways in certain parts of the Metropolis south of the River Thames, and for other purposes.

xcv. An Act to authorize the construction of Street Tramways from Pimlico to Peckham and Greenwich, and for other purposes.

xcvi. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands, and for the completion of the Garstang and Knot End Railway, and for increasing the capital of the Garstang and Knot End Railway Company.

xcvii. An Act for enabling the Milford Improvement Commissioners to borrow further monies, and for other purposes.

xcviii. An Act for improving and completing a direct line of railway communication between Glasgow and Kilmarnock, viâ Crofthead, and for vesting the same in the Caledonian and Glasgow and South-western Railway Companies; and for abandoning the Kilmarnock Direct Railway; and for other purposes.

xcix. An Act to authorize the Crystal Palace and South London Junction Railway Company to make a short Railway in the parish of Saint Mary, Lambeth, in the county of Surrey; and for other purposes.

c. An Act to consolidate and amend the several Acts relating to the Port and Harbour of Dublin and the Dublin Port and Docks Board; and for other purposes.

ci. An Act to authorize the construction of Street Tramways in certain parts of the Metropolis north of the River Thames, and for other purposes.

cii. An Act for supplying with Gas the towns of Aberdare and Aberaman and the parish of Aberdare, all in the county of Glamorgan.

ciii. An Act for further improving the Navigation of the River Severn, and for amending and extending the Severn Navigation Acts; and for other purposes.

civ. An Act for better supplying with Gas the parishes of Walton-on-Thames and Weybridge in the county of Surrey, and for supplying the parish of Shepperton in the county of Middlesex; and for other purposes.

cv. An Act to enable the North-eastern Railway Company to alter and abandon part of their authorized Gilling and Pickering Railway, and of their Port Clarence Branch, and to confer on the Company further powers in reference to other portions of their undertaking; and for other purposes.

cvi. An Act to incorporate a Company for better supplying Milnrow, in the parish of Rochdale in the county of Lancaster, and the neighbourhood thereof, with Gas; and for other purposes.

cvii. An Act to dissolve the Cleveland Water Company (Limited) and re-incorporate the members thereof, and to make further provision for the supply of water to Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Skelton, and other places in Cleveland; and for other purposes.

cviii. An Act for enabling the Dublin and Drogheda Railway Company to effect a communication between their railway and the works of the London and North-western Railway Company at the North Wall, Dublin; and for other purposes.

cix. An Act for conferring further powers on the Great Western Railway Company in relation to their own undertaking and the undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

cx. An Act for transferring to the Corporation of Huddersfield the undertaking of the Commissioners for the Huddersfield Waterworks, and for empowering the Corporation to construct additional Waterworks and to supply Water within extended limits; and for other purposes.

cxi. An Act for arranging the affairs of the Bristol and North Somerset Railway Company, and for other purposes.

cxii. An Act for better supplying with Water the towns of Walton, Weybridge, Chertsey, Byfleet, Cobham, and Shepperton, and the several parishes and places adjacent thereto, in the counties of Middlesex and Surrey; and for other purposes.

cxiii. An Act to revive and extend the time limited by "The Mid-Wales Railway (Western Extensions) Act, 1865," for the compulsory purchase of lands and completion of works, and to abandon the formation of the Railways authorized by "The Mid-Wales Railway Act, 1864," and "The Mid-Wales Railway (Eastern Extension) Act, 1865," respectively, and to enable the Mid-Wales Railway Company to use a portion of the Neath and Brecon Railway; and for other purposes.

cxiv. An Act for improving and maintaining the Harbour of Dundee and the Docks and Works connected therewith, and amending the Acts relating to the said Harbour; and for other purposes.

cxv. An Act for conferring additional powers on the London and North-Western Railway Company for the construction of new works, and in relation to their own undertaking and the undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

cxvi. An Act to confer additional powers on the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company for the construction of works, and otherwise in relation to their own undertaking and the undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

cxvii. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Manchester to purchase additional lands for the purposes of their Waterworks, to widen and alter Deansgate, to acquire additional lands, and to raise further monies; and for other purposes.

cxviii. An Act for authorizing the construction of a Dry Dock and other works at Newport by and for conferring other powers upon the Newport Harbour Commissioners.

cxix. An Act to confer various powers upon the North British Railway Company for the abandonment of certain railways and works, the purchase of lands for station purposes, and with respect to surperfluous lands, deferred preference dividends, and other matters connected with their undertaking; and for other purposes.

cxx. An Act to dissolve the Local Boards of the districts of Sutton and Parr, in the Borough of Saint Helens in the county of Lancaster, and to repeal the Saint Helens Improvement Act, 1855, and to constitute the Corporation of the said borough the Local Authority therein for the improving and governing of the said borough; to enable the said Corporation to extend their Waterworks and to purchase the undertakings of the Saint Helens Waterworks Company and the Saint Helens Gas Company; and for other purposes.

cxxi. An Act to incorporate a Company for extending the Thetford and Watton Railway to the Great Eastern Railway at Swaffham in Norfolk.

cxxii. An Act for granting further powers to "The Oxford Gaslight and Coke Company."

P. cxxiii. An Act to confirm three Provisional Orders made by the Poor Law Board under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, with reference to the city of Chester, the incorporated hundreds of Tunstead and Happing in the county of Norfolk, and the parish of Woolavington in the county of Sussex.

P. cxxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the districts of Bideford, Bournemouth, Bowness, Bristol, Croydon (2), Fleetwood, Hanley, Harrogate, Litchurch, Litherland, Portsmouth, Rochdale, Ryde, and Worthing; and for other purposes relative to certain districts under that Act.

cxxv. An Act for better supplying with Water the parish of Dorking in the county of Surrey.

cxxvi. An Act for enabling the Caledonian Railway Company to abandon certain authorized railways; for sanctioning the acquisition by that Company of certain land; for altering the mode of raising a portion of their authorized share capital; for authorizing the amalgamation of the Crieff and Methven Junction Railway Company with the Company, and agreements with other companies and parties; and for other purposes.

cxxvii. An Act to form into a separate undertaking the Bude and Torrington Extensions of the Devon and Cornwall Railway Company, and to incorporate a Company for the making and maintaining thereof; and for other purposes.

cxxviii. An Act to authorize the Imperial Gaslight and Coke Company to raise more money and purchase more land; and for other purposes.

cxxix. An Act for authorizing the Local Board of Health for the District of Keighley to make additional Waterworks, for extending the limits within which the Board may supply Water and Gas, for authorizing improvements in the town of Keighley; and for other purposes.

cxxx. An Act to increase the capital of the South Metropolitan Gaslight and Coke Company, and for other purposes with relation to the same Company.

cxxxi. An Act for defining and extending the powers of the Corporation of Wolverhampton in relation to the Management of Streets in the Borough, and to Sewerage, and to Police and other matters of Local Government, and to Water Supply; and for other purposes.

cxxxii. An Act to give further time for the completion of the Railways of the Dundalk and Greenore Railway Company and the joint works authorized by the Newry and Greenore Railway Act, 1863; and for other purposes.

cxxxiii. An Act to amend "The Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854," so far as relates to the town of Kingstown; and for other purposes.

cxxxiv. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to widen Hamilton Place and to extend the same into and improve Park Lane in the parish of Saint George, Hanover Square, in the county of Middlesex; and for other purposes.

cxxxv. An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Bradford, in the west riding of the county of York, to construct new Waterworks; and for other purposes.

cxxxvi. An Act to grant further powers to the Metropolitan Railway Company.

cxxxvii. An Act to enable the Severn and Wye Railway and Canal Company to improve and extend their undertaking; and for other purposes with relation to the same Company.

cxxxviii. An Act for making a Railway from the North-eastern Railway at Richmond to Reeth in the north riding of the county of York; and for other purposes.

cxxxix. An Act for better supplying with Water the borough of Truro in the county of Cornwall.

cxl. An Act for the conversion of the Mortgages of the Hereford, Hay, and Brecon Railway Company into Debenture Stock; and for other purposes relating to the same Company.

cxli. An Act for enabling the Festiniog Railway Company to widen and improve their railway, and to raise further money; and for other purposes.

cxlii. An Act to give further time for the completion of Brean Down Harbour, and for the compulsory purchase of lands for the Brean Down Docks; and for other purposes.

cxliii. An Act for making a Railway from Princes Risborough in the county of Buckingham to Watlington in the county of Oxford; and for other purposes.

cxliv. An Act to create and incorporate a Public Trust for supplying Water to the city of Edinburgh, town and port of Leith, town of Portobello, and districts and places adjacent; to transfer to the Trust the undertaking and powers of the Edinburgh Water Company; and for other purposes.

cxlv. An Act for vesting the undertaking of the Swansea Vale and Neath and Brecon Junction Railway Company in the Neath and Brecon Railway Company; for suspending legal proceedings against the Neath and Brecon Railway Company; for converting the mortgage and other debts into debenture stock; for raising money, and regulating the capital of that Company; and for other purposes.

cxlvi. An Act for making a railway from the Ely, Haddenham, and Sutton Railway at Haddenham to the Great Eastern Railway at Longstanton; and for other purposes.

cxlvii. An Act to make better provision for the Local Management of the borough of Sligo; and for dissolving the Town and Harbour Commissioners of Sligo, and vesting in the Corporation of the borough the powers of the Town Commissioners and incorporating a new body of Harbour Commissioners; and for empowering the Corporation to construct Waterworks and supply Water, and to acquire Gasworks and supply Gas; and for other purposes.

cxlviii. An Act to incorporate a Company for constructing Docks, Warehouses, and other works in the parish of Holyhead in the county of Anglesea; and for other purposes.

P. cxlix. An Act to confirm Provisional Orders under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

P. cl. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the districts of Aberystwith, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bath, Cleckheaton, Crompton, Newport (Monmouthshire), Reading, Southport, Stalybridge, and Weston-super-Mare.

cli. An Act to authorize the abandonment of a certain portion of the railways authorized by the Ellesmere and Glyn Valley Railway Act, 1866, and an extension of time for the compulsory purchase of lands and the completion of other portions of the said railways; and for other purposes.

clii. An Act for making a Railway from Callington to Calstock in the county of Cornwall, and for other purposes.

cliii. An Act to authorize the Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay Railway Company to raise a sum of money for their undertaking; and for other purposes.

cliv. An Act for conferring further powers upon the Furness Railway Company for the construction of Works and the acquisition of Lands, and otherwise in relation to their undertaking; and for other purposes.

clv. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands for, and completion of, the Belgravia and South Kensington New Road; and for other purposes.

clvi. An Act to authorize the construction of a Pier at Portobello in the county of Edinburgh.

clvii. An Act for making and maintaining a Market in Saint Luke, Chelsea, in the county of Middlesex; and for other purposes.

P. clviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Broughty Ferry.

P. clix. An Act to authorize the inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of a report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. An Act to authorize the exchange of parts of the entailed estate of Novar, in the counties of Ross and Elgin, for parts of the entailed estates of Contullich and Culcairn and the fee-simple lands of Inchcoulter, in the county of Ross.
2. An Act for making better provision respecting the disposition of the estate of the late Joseph Crossley of Halifax, deceased; and for other purposes.
3. An Act for authorizing the raising of Money on the security of part of the Settled Estates of the Marquis Camden for the purpose of the erection of a Mansion House thereon; and for other purposes.
4. An Act for confirming certain Building Leases granted by the Right Honorable Frederick Lord Calthorpe, Baron Calthorpe of Calthorpe in the county of Norfolk, deceased, of various parts of an estate situate in the parish of Edgbaston in the county of Warwick, and for altering the present powers of leasing over the same and other estates comprised in a re-settlement of the same dated the eighteenth day of July one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four; and for other purposes.
5. An Act for authorizing the leasing, selling, exchanging, and partitioning of Estates in the parish of Manchester in the county of Lancaster.
6. An Act to incorporate the Trustees of the deceased John Ferguson, of Cairnbrock, under the name of "The Ferguson Bequest Fund," and to enlarge the powers of said Trustees, the better to enable them to carry out the designs of the deceased.
7. An Act for enabling the Right Honorable Charles John Earl of Shrewsbury, and other the persons for the time being entitled to the estates annexed to the earldom of Shrewsbury, to make arrangements with the persons claiming to be entitled to or interested in lands at Oxton, in the county of Chester, under certain leases granted by Charles fifteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, John sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, and Bertram Arthur seventeenth Earl of Shrewsbury, respecting the premises comprised in such leases, and for annexing lands at Oxton to the earldom of Shrewsbury; and for other purposes.
8. An Act to authorize the Wardens and Commonalty of the Mystery of Grocers of the City of London, as Trustees under the will of Dame Margaret Slaney, deceased, to consent to the union of the Benefices of Allhallows Staining and Saint Olave Hart Street in the City of London, and for enabling the Trustees to carry into more complete effect the trusts of the will, and for facilitating such union.
9. An Act for authorizing mortgages of certain Real Estates in Manchester and Salford, in the county of Lancaster, subject to the will of the late Harriott Williams, deceased, and for other purposes, and of which the short title is "Williams's Estate Act, 1869."
10. An Act for authorizing the Trustees of the settlement dated the 5th day of June 1830, executed in accordance with the directions contained in the will of William Wilshere, Esquire, deceased, to pull down part of the family mansion called the Frythe, and to rebuild the same, and to make alterations in the remaining part of the mansion, and to build cottages on tho settled estates, and for authorizing the granting of building leases and sales of parts of the settled estates, and for obtaining the enfranchisement of copyholds; and for other purposes.

PRIVATE ACTS,

NOT PRINTED.

11. An Act to relieve Alexander Hugh Bruce, of Kennet, in the county of Clackmannan, Esquire, and the heirs for the time being of the body of Michael first Lord Balfour of Burley, in the Peerage of Scotland, from the effect of the attainder of Robert fifth Lord Balfour of Burley.
12. An Act to confer upon Pandeli Ralli all the rights, privileges, and capacities of a Natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

[INDEX.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE FIRST SESSION OF

THE TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

32° & 33° VICTORIA.

1868-9.

Explanation of the Abbreviations.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1^{a}, 2^{a}, 3^{a}, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS—CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EDUCATION—CRIMINAL LAW.

ABERCORN, Duke of
  Ireland — Religious Disturbances, [197] 1226
    State of, [196] 727
  Ireland—Crime, Address for Returns, [194] 949
  Irish Church, [196] 1581; 2R. [197] 184, 201, 207

ABINGER, Lord
  Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1759; Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [196] 447; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 461; Report, 1283; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1288
  Salmon Fishery Act (Scotland), [197] 1753
  Scotland — Salmon Fisheries, Motion for a Return, [194] 1082

Abyssinian Expedition
  Advances by Indian Government, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, [194] 110; Observations, Mr. White, Sir George Jenkinson; Reply, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 4, 631
  Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 2, [195] 30
    Parl. Papers—
    Report of Mr. Rassam . . . . [4088]
    Lord Napier's Explanation . . . 92
    Report of Consul Cameron . . . [4089]
    (*See* SUPPLY—WAYS and MEANS)

Abyssinian War—Cost of the War
  Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, [196] 106

[*cont.*

Abyssinian War—cont.
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the causes of the great excess of cost in prosecuting the War with Abyssinia over the estimate submitted to Parliament" (*Mr. Candlish*) *June* 8, [196] 1439 ; after debate, Motion agreed to
Moved, "That the Select Committee on the Abyssinian War do consist of nineteen Members" (*Mr. Candlish*) *June* 21, [197] 398
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) ; Motion withdrawn ; original Question put, and agreed to ; Mr. Baxter nominated one of the Members of the said Committee
Moved, "That Sir Stafford Northcote be one other Member of the said Committee ;" A. 26, N. 5 ; M. 21 ; [House counted out]
Moved, "That Sir Stafford Northcote be one other Member of the Select Committee on the Abyssinian War" *June* 24, 566
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Order [21st June] that the Select Committee on the Abyssinian War do consist of nineteen Members be discharged" (*Mr. Craufurd*) ; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to ; main Question put, and agreed to
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Candlish (Chairman), Major Anson, Colonel Barttelot, Mr. Baxter, Captain Beaumont, Mr. Christopher Denison, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Eastwick, Lord Elcho, Sir James Elphinstone, Sir John Hay, Mr. Holms, Mr. Howes, Mr. Mundella, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Seely, Mr. Charles Turner, and Mr. White
Report of Select Committee *July* 30 (*Parl. P.* No. 380)

Accounts, &c. Presentation Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered* *July* 22
Read 1º* *July* 26 [Bill 240]
Read 2º* *July* 29
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Read 3º* *July* 31
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 2 (No. 253)
Read 2ª* *August* 5
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª* *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 86]

ACLAND, Mr. T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 488, 510
Army Estimates—Yeomanry, [196] 1576
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1313 ; *cl.* 2, 1321
Deanery of Lichfield and Rectory of Tatenhill, [194] 833 ; [195] 676
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1414 ; Comm. *cl.* 15, [196] 1766 ; *cl.* 19, 1770, 1771 ; *cl.* 29, 1774 ; *cl.* 41, 1780
Endowed Schools (No. 2), Comm. [198] 1467
St. James and St. Paul's, Lancashire, [195] 576
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 190
Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
Poor Law Commission, [197] 1691
Telegraph, Consid. [198] 975
Tithe Commission, [197] 1684

ADDERLEY, Right Hon. Sir C. B., *Staffordshire, N.*
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1122
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 90, Amendt. [197] 1756, 1758
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1223, 1227
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 15, [196] 1766 ; *cl.* 29, 1775
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1260, 1264
Hudson's Bay Company, [195] 680
Newfoundland Confederation, [194] 1091
New Zealand, Affairs of, [198] 486
South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 647
Supply—Colonial Grants in Aid, [198] 954, 960
Emigration, [198] 961
West Indies, The, [197] 1889

Adjutants (Jury) Exemption Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Stratheden*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª* *April* 26 (No. 75)
Read 2ª* *August* 5
Order for Committee discharged *August* 6

Admiralty District Registries Bill
(*Mr. Graves, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Rathbone*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º* *July* 20 [Bill 229]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 28

Admiralty Jurisdiction (County Courts) Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Candlish*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º* *Feb* 17 [Bill 2]
Bill withdrawn* *May* 11

Adulteration of Food or Drink Act (1860) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dixon, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Goldney*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º* *April* 13 [Bill 78]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 21

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. J. MONCREIFF), *Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 859
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1410 ; *cl.* 54, 1596
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 122, [197] 1765
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Leave, [195] 755 ; Comm. [197] 160
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1726, 2068 ; Nomination of Committee, [196] 634
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], Leave, [194] 536 ; 2R. [197] 505
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 883, 884
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 379, 397
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 131, 277; 3R. 1010
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 362 ; *cl.* 1, 366
Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 192

[*cont.*

Advocate, The Lord—*cont.*
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1711, 1732
198] Comm. 234, 807, 815; *cl.* 1, 819; Amendt. 823; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 824, 831, 835, 1104, 1107; *cl.* 4, 1112, 1114; *cl.* 6, 1116; *cl.* 8, 1118; *cl.* 9, 1119; *cl.* 11, 1121; *cl.* 12, 1122; *cl.* 14, *ib.*; *cl.* 17, 1123; *cl.* 19, 1124, 1125; *cl.* 24, 1241, 1375, 1376, 1379, 1394; *cl.* 59, 1443, 1446; *cl.* 66, 1446, 1448; *add. cl.* 1450; Consid. *add. cl.* 1452, 1453, 1465; 3R. 1495, 1497, 1535
Pharmacy Act Amendment, Comm. [195] 1934
Poor Law (Scotland) Act Amendment, Leave, [195] 756; [198] 1253
Scotland—Assessments, [194] 1188
Education, [194] 1904
Sheriff Courts, [196] 1635
Scotland—Endowed Schools, &c., Motion for a Commission, [196] 1444
Scotland—Faggot Votes for Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1279
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 529
Speaker, Election of a, [194] 10
Supply—Report, [198] 694

Agar-Ellis, Hon. L. G. F., *Kilkenny Co.*
Ireland—Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [195] 1098
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2033; Comm. *cl.* 26, 1628; *cl.* 58, [196] 395

Aggravated Assaults Amendment Bill
[h.l.] (*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 20 (No. 66)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 11, [196] 564
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Earl of Morley*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this day six months

Agricultural Labour Commission
Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 2, [194] 484

Agricultural Labourers—Education
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the education of agricultural labourers is in general in so unsatisfactory a condition that immediate legislation upon the subject is imperatively demanded; this House therefore thinks that the Government ought to legislate upon the subject during the next Session of Parliament" (*Mr. Fawcett*), [197] 582; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Agricultural Statistics, 1869
Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Bright *Mar* 23, [194] 2001
Moved, "That the Agricultural Returns, now made annually, should, after this year, be discontinued, and collected every fifth year in the place of annually" (*Mr. Pell*) *April* 13, [195] 753; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 30, [197] 823; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Bright *May* 28, [196] 938
Parl. Papers—
England . . . . [4200]
Ireland . . . . [4113]
Labourers' Earnings, 1869-70 . . 371

Agriculture, Department of
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the action with reference to Agriculture of various Public Authorities, with a view to consider the expediency of recommending that some one Department be made responsible for dealing with administrative and legislative questions affecting Agriculture" (*Mr. Acland*) *Mar* 2, [194] 488; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Employment of Women and Children in, Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 13, [195] 678
Second Report—*Parl. P.* [4202]

Airlie, Earl of
Children, &c. Protection, 2R. Amendt. [197] 1865
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 30, [197] 1884
Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 708
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1763; [195] 569; Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 446; *cl.* 20, 456; *cl.* 68, 464; Report, 1282, 1284
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1686
Scotland—Hypothec, Law of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1178, 1652

Akroyd, Mr. E., *Halifax*
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1519
Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [195] 1776
Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture, [195] 678
Wine Duties, Reduction of, [197] 1270
Workshops Regulation Act in Birmingham, [195] 583

Albemarle, Earl of
Justices of the Peace Qualification, 2R. [197] 507, 511, 513

Allen, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyne*
Army—Cupping in the, [195] 1097
Irish Church, 3R. [196] 1006
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1268

Amcotts, Colonel W. E., *Leicestershire, Mid.*
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1816
Prisons (Religious Instruction), Motion for Returns, [198] 351

Amphlett, Mr. R. P., *Worcestershire, E.*
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1813
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 13, [198] 1281

Ancient Monuments, Preservation of
Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 2, [195] 27
(*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Agar-Ellis; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 19, 1098

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*
Army Estimates—General Officers' Pay, [197] 148
Land Forces, [194] 1164
195] Bankruptcy, 2R. 168
196] Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1211, 1212; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1224; *cl.* 30, 1403; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1417; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1593, 1597; *cl.* 88, Amendt. 1606; *cl.* 130, 1909
197] 328; *add. cl.* 419
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 572
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 423; *cl.* 5, 575; Consid. *cl.* 5, 767
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 366
Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [197] 480
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 822; 3R. 1497
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 533
Scotland—Poor Law Amendment, [198] 1253
Supply—Foreign Office, [197] 1679
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677
House of Commons Offices, [197] 1477
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 510
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 664

ANNESLEY, Hon. Colonel H., *Cavan Co.*
Ireland—Fenianism, [194] 1659, 1904
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1489

Annuity Tax (Edinburgh) Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Miller, Mr. Crum-Ewing*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. M'Laren*) *Feb* 24, [194] 280; Bill ordered, after short debate
Read 1° * *Feb* 25 [Bill 19]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 30, [197] 838
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Graham Montgomery*), 843; after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 151, N. 142; M. 9; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *July* 6 [Bill 198]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 20

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Army—Branding Deserters, [196] 101
Army Estimates—Buildings and Repairs, [195] 670
Martial Law, [195] 660
Militia, &c. [196] 1574
Carriage of Live Stock, [194] 630
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 438; Comm. *cl.* 60, [197] 1529; *cl.* 63, Amendt. 1531, 1533, 1534; *cl.* 122, 1765; *add. cl.* 1770
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 632
India—Troops in Bhootan, [198] 1144
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1722, 1733; Comm. [198] 812; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 817, 821; *cl.* 2, 824, 1097; *cl.* 9, 1119; *cl.* 17, 1123, 1463

[*cont.*

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R.—*cont.*
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1272
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 519
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 511, 513
Report, [198] 696
Stationery Office, [197] 1700

ANTROBUS, Mr. E., *Wilton*
Salisbury Magistrates, [196] 1620

ARCHDALL, Capt. M. E., *Fermanagh Co.*
Incumbered Estates Court, Ireland—Earl of Lanesborough's Estate, [195] 518
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1277
Ireland—Tarleton, Captain, Assassination of, [195] 1849
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 877; *cl.* 18, 1479, 1483, 1485

ARGYLL, Duke of (Secretary of State for India)
Government of India Act Amendment, [195] 222; 1R. 1069, 1082, 1087; 2R. 1834, 1841; Report, [196] 691, 697, 699, 702
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1055, 1078; Comm. [195] 130
India—Bengal Bank at Bombay, [197] 513
Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 521, 545, 554
Weights and Measures, Address for Papers, [198] 796
197] Irish Church, 2R. 70, 197, 201, 206, 207, 288; Comm. *cl.* 14, 892, 896, 899; *cl.* 27, 1017, 1021; *cl.* 41, 1161; *cl.* 68, 1242, 1248; Report, 1502; Commons Amendts. [198] 289, 292, 294
Life Peerages, Report, [196] 1370, 1373
Lord Napier's Annuity—Bill withdrawn, [194] 932
194] Parochial Schools (Scotland), 1R. 284; 2R. 1759, 1777, 1782
195] 569, 570, 1574, 1575
196] Comm. 432, 436, 438, 443; *cl.* 1, 444, 445, 447; *cl.* 19, 448; *cl.* 20, *ib.*; *cl.* 21, 460; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 461; *cl.* 37, *ib.*; *cl.* 52, 462; *cl.* 68, 463, 465; *cl.* 70, 466; Report, Amendt. 1281, 1283, 1284; *cl.* 18, 1288; *cl.* 28, Amendt. *ib.*, 1291, 1293
198] Commons Amendts. 1470, 1474
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1680, 1691
Scotland — Hypothec, Law of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1183, 1184
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *add. cl.* [196] 81
Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1551

ARMITSTEAD, Mr. G., *Dundee*
India—Calcutta Port Dues, [198] 1091
Merchant Seamen and Greenwich Hospital, [196] 745

ARMY
Aldershot—Drill, Brigade and Divisional Field Days, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 19, [198] 156; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 22, 454

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Artillery

Whitworth Gun, Question, Mr. T. Hughes; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 18, [194] 1660

Small Arms

Breech-Loading Rifles, Report of Special Committee—*Parl. P.* . . . . . [4119]

Correspondence . . . . [4091]

Committees on New Arms, Question, Observations, Colonel Barttelot; Reply, Mr. Cardwell; short debate thereon *July* 22, [198] 493

Henry-Martini Rifle, Questions, Mr. Muntz, Lord Elcho; Answers, Captain Vivian *August* 6, [198] 1370

India, Rifles for, Question, Mr. Dixon; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 18, [194] 1653

Ball Ammunition in Barracks, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *August* 5, [198] 1292

Branding Deserters, Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *April* 12, [195] 573; Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 4, [196] 101; Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 11, 573

Canada—Reduction of Forces, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 13, [196] 747

Canteens—Sale of Wines and Spirits, Question, Mr. R. Shaw; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, [194] 1464

Cartridge Making—Mr. Groundwater's Invention, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 1, [194] 410

Chaplains, Reduction of Army, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 13, [195] 678

Chelmsford—Rifle Range at, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 6, [196] 263

China and Japan—Allowances to Troops in, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, [194] 1463 (*Parl. P.* No. 133)

Commissions, Examinations for, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 4, [194] 629

Concentration of Army Offices—Dover House, Question, Mr. R. Shaw; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 26, [195] 1577

Courts Martial Commission

Second Report, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 10, [196] 1495

Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 20, [198] 324

Parl. Papers—

First Report . . . . [4114]

Second Report . . . . . . [4114-I]

Crimea—British Graves in the, Question, Mr. Stopford; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 3, [196] 17; *May* 13, 747

Crimean Prize Money, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 12, [197] 1669

Cupping in the, Question, Mr. W. S. Allen; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 19, [195] 1097

Fines for Drunkenness—Responsibility of Company Officers, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 7, [196] 1295

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Fortifications

Armament of Sea and Land Defences, Observations, Lord Garlies *June* 17, [197] 141

Gun Shields—Moncrieff Gun-Carriages, Observations, Captain F. E. B. Beaumont; Reply, Mr. Cardwell; short debate thereon *June* 10, [196] 1570 — *Coalhouse Fort*, Question, Captain F. E. B. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 29, [198] 895

Report of Committee on—*Parl. P.* [4092]

Suspension of Expenditure, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 6, [195] 232

Parl. Papers—

Report of Committee . . . . [4135]

Expenditure 311, 430

Statement 330

Gunpowder Magazines at Upnor, Question, Mr. P. Wykeham-Martin; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 5, [197] 1168

Half-Pay List — Case of Captain Rintoul, Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answers, Mr. Cardwell *May* 7, [196] 389

Household Cavalry—The Cornetcies, Question, General Forester; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 11, [196] 572

India

Cavalry Regiments for India—Case of Major ——, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 19, [198] 154

Colonels in India, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 15, [197] 1888

Indian Officers, Return of (*Parl. Paper*, No. 440), Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Feb* 23, [194] 204

Medal for Service in India—Umbeyla Campaign, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 28, [197] 624—*Bhootan*, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 8, 1424

Relief of Regiments in India, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Captain Vivian *July* 8, [197] 1421

3rd West India Regiment, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 19, [194] 1789

Irish Militia; Training of the, Questions, Colonel French, Colonel Forde; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 19, [194] 125

Japan—Officers of the Army in, Observations, Colonel North; Reply, Mr. Stansfeld; short debate thereon *July* 29, [198] 899 (*Parl. P.* No. 133)

Lunatics—Murder of Serjeant Barnes, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 26, [195] 1576

MacLoughlin, Case of Dr., Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Captain Vivian *July* 29, [198] 896

Mauritius—Troops at the, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Captain Vivian *June* 11, [196] 1590

Military Appointments, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 26, [194] 355

Military Force of the Kingdom, Observations, Lord Monck; Reply, Lord Northbrook; debate thereon *April* 23, [195] 1420

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Military Prison at Dublin, Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Mr. Vivian *July* 20, [198] 325

Military Train, Question, Mr. W. F. Cowper; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 20, [195] 1200

Militia Adjutants—See title *Army—Adjutancies of Militia*

Militia, Armament of—The Snider Rifle, Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 23, [194] 2002

Militia and Reserve Forces—Snider-Enfield Rifles, Question, and Motion for, "Return of the number of Snider-Enfield Rifles converted, the number issued, and the number in store" (*Major Walker*) *April* 27, [195] 1759; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Militia Officers — Honorary Rank, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 13, [196] 749

Militia Quartermasters—Retiring Allowances, Question, Mr. W E. Price; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 4, [194] 630

Militia—West Kent, Question, Mr. Whatman; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 13, [195] 678

Parl. Papers—
Militia Regiments Returns . . . 265
Militia Regiments Foreign Service . 318

New Zealand War Medal, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 26, [194] 352

Non-Purchase Corps, Promotion in, Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 30, [198] 995

Ordnance Survey

(*England*), *Mining Districts*, Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 23, [194] 1999

(*Scotland*), Question, Mr. A. Johnston; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 30, [195] 1974

The 6-inch Scale, Question, Mr. Hoskyns; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 1, [197] 946
Report for 1868—*Parl. P.* . . . [4124]

Patriotic Fund Commission — Report of Executive Committee, Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 10, [196] 469

Pay of Regimental Colonels—King's Dragoon Guards and 1st Royals, Question, Mr. H. R. Brand; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 22, [195] 1362

Retirement of Officers — Committee of 1865, Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 19, [195] 1095

Royal Horse Artillery—C. Brigade, Question, Mr. Walsh; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 21, [197] 359

Storage of Saltpetre, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 26, [195] 1584

Volunteer Capitation Grant, Question, Mr. Simonds; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 7, [196] 1298 (*Parl. P.* No. 142)

Volunteers—Ammunition for Galloway Rifles, Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Captain Vivian *June* 11, [196] 1591

Wightman—Case of Ensign, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 7, [196] 388

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Wimbledon Review, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Captain Vivian *August* 9, [198] 1493

Parl. Papers—
Report on 432
Manchester, &c. 173

Yeomanry Cavalry, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 22, [194] 158

Army—Adjutancies of Militia

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "the declaration which has to be signed by incoming Adjutants of Militia ought to be annulled" (*Mr. Sartoris*), [197] 138; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Buckingham Palace Guard Room

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy or Extracts of Correspondence between the Board of Works, the War Office, and the Royal Engineer Department of the Horse Guards, which has taken place on the subject of Buckingham Palace Guard Room, since August last" (*Viscount Bury*), [197] 137; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Clerks of the Works and Royal Engineers

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the Clerks of the Works and Clerks of the Royal Engineer Department are entitled to or should be granted the same rights and privileges, according to their relative rank, as are extended to other non-combatants in the Military Service" (*Mr. Montagu Chambers*), [197] 134; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Government of the Army—Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State

Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 23, [194] 203; Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 4, 625

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 11, To leave out from "That" and add "in order to promote greater economy and efficiency, the Departments of the Horse Guards and the War Office should be placed under the control of one responsible Minister" (*Mr. White*), [194] 1094; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn (*Parl. P.* No. 75)

Army—Major M'Gwire's Camping System

Question, Mr. Knight; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 1, [197] 944

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That" and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of all Reports and Correspondence on the subject of Major M'Gwire's Camping System, from the first Report by Lord W. Paulett, in 1864, to the present date" (*Mr. Knight*), [198] 720; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Military Labour

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, an authorized organization should be adopted for extending the system of 'Military labour to Military works' to all stations of Her Majesty's Army" (*Mr. Hanbury Tracy*), [195] 642; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 26, [198] 684

Aldershot Barracks, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Captain Vivian *June* 3, [196] 1209

Army of Reserve

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the establishment of a sufficient and reliable Army Reserve is a matter of urgent need" (*Lord Elcho*), [196] 1499; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—School of Musketry at Hythe

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Report on the sanitary state of the School of Musketry at Hythe, the number of officers reported sick between the 1st of March and the 30th of April 1869, and cost of maintaining the establishment of the School of Musketry there for one year" (*The Lord Kinnaird*) *July* 12, [197] 1594; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 203)

Asia, Central

Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, Mr. Eastwick *April* 8, [195] 362; Question, Observations, Mr. Eastwick; Reply, Mr. Grant Duff; debate thereon *July* 9, [197] 1544

Assessed Rates Bill

(*Mr. Goschen, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. John Bright*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Goschen*) *Feb* 25, [194] 315; Bill ordered, after short debate

Read 1°* *Feb* 26 [Bill 21]

Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Mar* 3, 556; Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 4, 628; Question, Lord Henley; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 15, [195] 842

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 7, [196] 1299; after long debate, Bill read 2°

Committee*; Report *June* 8 [Bill 149]

197] Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 21, 360

. Committee; Report *June* 24, 519 [Bill 178]

. Considered *July* 2, 1082

Read 3°* *July* 5

l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 6 (No. 174)

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, 1750; after short debate, Bill read 2ª

Committee*; Report *July* 20

Read 3ª* *July* 23

Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 41]

Assessed Taxes, Collection of

Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, [194] 766; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1086

Assessed Tax Papers, 1869-70

Questions, Sir George Jenkinson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 4, [198] 1250

ASSHETON, Mr. R., *Clitheroe*

Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 830

Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 572

ATHLUMNEY, Lord

Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 28, [197] 1053; Commons Amendts. [198] 433

Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1184; Comm. 1567

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir R. P. Collier), *Plymouth*

194] Bankruptcy, Leave, 776, 795, 1186

195] 2R. 142, 166, 169

196] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1211; *cl.* 5, 1212; *cl.* 6, 1213, . 1215, 1216; *cl.* 7, 1217, 1218; *cl.* 8, 1219; . *cl.* 13, 1220; *cl.* 14, 1222; Amendt. 1223; . *cl.* 15, 1225; *cl.* 32, 1402; *cl.* 36, 1403; . *cl.* 43, 1404; *cl.* 46, 1405, 1412, 1414, 1415, . 1416; *cl.* 47, 1416, 1417; *cl.* 49, *ib.*; *cl.* 53, . 1418, 1592; *cl.* 54, 1596, 1597; *cl.* 59, 1598, . 1603; *cl.* 91, 1898, 1899; *cl.* 126, 1902, . 1903, 1904, 1905; *cl.* 127, Amendt. 1906; . *cl.* 129, 1907

197] *cl.* 130, Amendt. 314; *cl.* 131, 414; Amendt. . 415, 416; *add. cl.* 417, 418, 419, 420

198] Lords Amendts. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1093, 1094; . *cl.* 14, 1095

Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 559

Bridgwater Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 25

Coronation Oath, [198] 894, 907, 908

Corrupt Practices Commissions, [195] 1975

County Courts, 2R. [194] 1571

Election Commissions, [196] 750

Election Petition Judgments, [194] 765

Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1808

[*cont.*

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The—*cont.*
195] Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. 178
197] Comm. *cl.* 4, 421 ; Amendt. 428, 429 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 430, 575 ; *cl.* (D) 12, Amendt. 578, 579 ; *cl.* 14, 580 ; *cl.* 18, 581 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 760 ; *cl.* 5, 761, 764, 766, 767
Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal, [197] 1526 ; Comm. 1527
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 999 ; *cl.* 12, 1111
Juries, Special and Common, [194] 352
Law of Forfeiture on Conviction of Felony, [197] 1542
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 623, 627
Norwich Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 3
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 197, 199
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 669
  Bridgwater Election, [194] 2000
  Drogheda Writ, [194] 151
  Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2070
Parliamentary Disqualification, [197] 351
Patent Laws, [194] 356
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 920
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 985
Stannaries, Leave, [194] 403
Statute Law, Revision of the, [194] 1653 ; Res. [196] 1254
Supply—British Museum, [198] 224

Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration Bill (*Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Morley, Mr. George Gregory*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *August* 3 [Bill 260]

Audit of Public Accounts
Observations, Mr. Candlish ; Reply, Mr. Ayrton ; short debate thereon *June* 28, [197] 626
Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866, Observations, Mr. Hunt ; Reply, Mr. Candlish ; short debate thereon *July* 5, [197] 1190
Parl. Papers—
  First and Second Reports . . 87, 87-I
  Third Report 303, 303-I
  Fourth Report 356

Australia, Western—Emigration to
Question, Mr. Alderman J. C. Lawrence ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 5, [197] 1166

Australian Legislative Assembly — The O'Farrell Papers
Question, Mr. Newdegate ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 19, [194] 1791
195] *April* 2, 30 ; Question, Mr. Newdegate ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 23, 1468 ; *April* 26, 1584
Order [6th April] for Address for Return relative to O'Farrell's crime read *April* 27, 1741 ; Moved, "That the said Order be discharged" (*Mr. Monsell*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 123, N. 15 ; M 108 ; Question, Mr. Newdegate ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 29, 1854 ; Question, Mr. Newdegate ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone ; long debate thereon *April* 30, 2064 ; Question, Observations, Mr. Newdegate ; Reply, Mr. Monsell ; short debate thereon *May* 3, [196] 17

Austria—Commercial Treaty with
Question, Mr. E. Egerton ; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 13, [196] 970

AYRTON, Mr. A. S. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Tower Hamlets*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1438
Army—Crimean Prize Money, [197] 1669
Assessed Taxes, [194] 556
Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 629
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 54, [196] 1594 ; *cl.* 88, 1606 ; *cl.* 118, 1900 ; *cl.* 129, 1906 ; *cl.* 130, Amendt. 1907 ; [197] 317, 327
Civil Service Estimates, [195] 27
Clearing Vessels at the Custom House, [197] 1754
Consecration Fees, [194] 309
Consolidated Fund (£17,100,000), 2R: [195] 1648
Convention of Paris, Motion for Papers, [196] 1446
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 775
Court of Probate (Registrar Clerks), [196] 1495
Courts of Justice—Carey Street Site, [198] 1144
Currency Laws, [198] 1054
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [196] 857
Customs, Clerks in the, [197] 624 ; [198] 1525
Dagenham Dock Company, [198] 1372
Dividends on Government Securities, [198] 800
Durham County Courts, [195] 976
Edmunds' Scandal, The, [196] 470
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 579
Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866, [197] 1193
Financial Statement—Assessed Taxes, [195] 479
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [198] 1364
Gravesend County Court, [195] 1579
Imperial Gas, Consid. Amendt. [195] 1792
Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham), 2R. [194] 1894
Inclosure of Commons, [195] 976
Ireland—Questions, &c.
  Dublin (City) Election, [194] 832
  Fisheries, [197] 571
  Howth Harbour, [197] 948
  Maynooth College, [195] 51
  Medical and Educational Charges, [194] 304
  Salmon Fisheries, Shannon, [196] 743
  Salmon Passes on the Shannon, [197] 649
  Seizure of Fishing Smacks, [197] 948, 949
  Stationery Office, [196] 573
Libel, 2R. [194] 1616
Mail Contracts, Res. Amendt. [196] 1157
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 498
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 303
Metropolis—New Public Offices, [197] 1672
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 326, 334 ; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1056 ; *cl.* 34, 1056 ; *add. cl.* 1057, 1058, 1060 ; Consid. Amendt. 1127 ; 3R. 1338
Newspapers and the British Museum, [195] 1463
Newspapers, &c. Comm. [195] 1416, 1417
Newspapers, Registration, &c. of, [198] 560

[*cont.*

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
  Park Lane and Piccadilly Thoroughfare, Motion for Papers, [195] 756
  Parliament—Easter Recess, [194] 556
    New Writs, [194] 16, 20
    Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2071
  Parliamentary Returns, [197] 1887
  Post Office—Foreign Mails, [194] 124
  Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 817, 818
  Registration (Ireland) Act, [194] 839
  Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1584
  Savings Banks, [196] 101
  Scotland—Ayrshire, Distributor of Stamps for, [198] 1144
    Portpatrick Harbour, [194] 1657; [195] 986
  Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1482
  Statute Law, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1252
  Sunday Trading, 2R. [194] 562; Comm. [195] 805
  Supply—Admiralty Court Registry (Ireland), [198] 911
    Board of Manufactures (Scotland), [198] 507
    Board of Trade, [197] 1682
    Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 522
    Common Law Courts, [198] 1002
    Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1468, 1470, 1471, 1473
    County Courts, [198] 908, 909
    Dublin Metropolitan Police, [198] 912
    Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [198] 913
    Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1465
    Excesses on Grants, [194] 772
    Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 966, 967
    Four Courts Marshalsea Prison, [198] 913
    House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476, 1477, 1478
    House of Lords Offices, [197] 1475, 1476
    Landed Estates Court (Ireland), [198] 911
    Land Registry Office, [198] 909
    Learned Societies, [198] 504, 506
    Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 508, 509, 511, 512, 513
    Lunacy Commission, [197] 1685
    Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 970, 972, 973, 974
    National Gallery, [198] 500, 503
    New Law Courts, [196] 1578
    Non-conforming Clergy, [198] 966
    Office of Woods, [197] 1701, 1703, 1704, 1705
    Patent Office, [197] 1686
    Poor Law Administration, [198] 507
    Post Office Packet Service, [194] 770, 771
    Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211; [198] 909
    Public Buildings, [197] 676
    Public Offices Site, [197] 1201, 1205
    Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1460, 1462
    Public Works (Ireland) (Salaries), [198] 515, 745, 746
    Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Department, [197] 1711
    Rates on Government Property, [197] 1457, 1459
    Record Office, [197] 1693
    Relief of Distressed British Seamen, [198] 963
    Report, [194] 537; [198] 518, 519
[*cont.*

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
    Stationery Office, [197] 1696, 1700
    Superannuation and Retired Allowances, [198] 962, 963
    Temporary Commissions, [198] 966
    Tithe Commission, [197] 1684
    Tonnage Bounties, &c. [198] 961
    Treasury, &c. Departments, [197] 1479
    Works, &c. [197] 1707, 1709
  Treasury Board, [194] 124
  Wine Duties, Reduction of, [197] 1271
  Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 129

AYTOUN, Mr. R. Sinclair, *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
  British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1103
  Canada—Intercolonial Railway, [196] 877
    Railway Loan, Res. [197] 1445
  Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1330
  Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 633
  Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], 2R. [197] 504
  Gold Coinage—Melting of English Sovereigns, [198] 1527
  Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 397
  Ireland—Maynooth College, [194] 1465
  Irish Church, Comm. Instruction, [195] 847, 871, 877, 878; *cl.* 37, [196] 73; *cl.* 39, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 147, 267, 281; Amendt. 301, 308, 343
  Murphy's, Mr., Lectures, [195] 759
  Navy—Coal for the, [196] 879
  Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 811; *cl.* 2, 835, 1098; *cl.* 24, 1240; *cl.* 66, 1447
  Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1029
  Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1472
    Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1444
    Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 948

BAGWELL, Mr. J., *Clonmel*
  Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 232
  Ireland—Stationery Office, [196] 573
    Tipperary, Extra Police in, [196] 744
  Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1169
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1860; *cl.* 32, [196] 34; *cl.* 58, 393; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 420; Consid. 764; Lords' Amendts. [198] 23
  O'Sullivan's Disability, [196] 185, 186; Leave, 192

Bahamas—Ecclesiastical Grants
  Question, Mr. Miall; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 12, [195] 581
    Copy of Act—(*Parl. P.* No. 407)

BAINES, Mr. E., *Leeds*
  Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1413
  China—Communication with, [198] 1032
  Education—Schools for Children of the Working Classes, [194] 1996
  Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 566
  Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 15, [196] 1767, 1768
[*cont.*

BAINES, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Factory Returns, [194] 202
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1815
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* (D) 12, Amendt. [197] 578
India—China, Route to, [198] 799
Libel, Leave, [194] 276 ; 2R. 1599 ; [195] 757, 758
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1278, 1279
Newspapers, Registration, &c. of, [198] 560
Post Office—Money Orders, [196] 13
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 464
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 194
Telegraphs, [195] 845

BAKER, Mr. R. B. Wingfield, *Essex, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [197] 1292 ; *add. cl.* 1771
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1394
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 23, [195] 1527
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 553

BALL, Right Hon. J. T., *Dublin University*
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1179
Ireland—Church Leases, [195] 1095, 1096
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1284
Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [198] 1201
Irish Church, 2R. Motion for Adjournment,
194] 1758, 1791
195] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1002, 1019, 1022 ; *cl.* 10,
. 1103, 1105 ; *cl.* 13, 1126 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt.
. 1137, 1145, 1372 ; *cl.* 15, 1389, 1402,
. 1404 ; *cl.* 16, 1406 ; *cl.* 18, 1486, 1488 ;
. *cl.* 19, 1490 ; *cl.* 20, 1495, 1497 ; *cl.* 22,
. Amendt. 1506 ; *cl.* 23, 1523 ; *cl.* 24, Amendt.
. 1585 ; *cl.* 26, 1623 ; *cl.* 27, 1637, 1880 ;
. *cl.* 29, 1916
196] *cl.* 32, 33, 41 ; *cl.* 33, 61 ; *cl.* 61, 421 ; *cl.* 3,
. 423 ; Consid. 764 ; *add. cl.* 766, 767, 768,
. 771, 772 ; Amendt. 776, 778 ; *3R. 1028
197] Lords' Amendts. 1925, 1957, 1960, 1963,
. 1964, 1974, 1975, 1976 ; [198] 46, 99
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 361 ; *cl.* 1, 365
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 223
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1855
Real Property, Res. [196] 600
Supply—Education, National, [198] 740

BANDON, Earl of
Ireland—State of, [196] 733
Irish Church, Comm. Preamble, [197] 730 ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 869 ; *cl.* 14, 913 ; *cl.* 41, 1160 ; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1164 ; Report, 1486 ; Amendt. 1489 ; Commons' Amendts. [198] 439, 443
Municipal Magistrates, Removal of, [196] 1095

Bank of England—Payment of Dividends
Question, Mr. Stephen Cave ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, [196] 263

Bankruptcy Bill—Public Business
Question, Lord Chelmsford ; Answer, The Lord Chancellor ; short debate thereon *Feb* 18, [194] 95

Bankruptcy Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
194] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 5, 776 ; Bill ordered, after debate
. Question, Mr. Cross ; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 12, 1186
Read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 50]
Read 2°, after debate *April* 5, [195] 142
Committee * ; Report *April* 26 [Bill 97]
196] Committee (*on re-comm.*) — R.P. *June* 3, 1211
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 8, 1402
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 11, 1592
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 15, 1897
197] Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 18, 314
. Committee ; Report *June* 22, 414 [Bill 169]
Considered * *June* 25
Read 3° * *June* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 28
. Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª " *July* 8, 1403 ; after debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 154)
198] Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *July* 16, 15 ; after short debate, on Question, " That the words, &c. ;" resolved in the negative ; Bill referred to a Select Committee
And, on *July* 19, the Lords following were named of the Committee :—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Privy Seal, V. Halifax, L. Overstone, L. Belper, L. Chelmsford, L. Westbury, L. Romilly, L. Colonsay, L. Cairns, L. Penzance
Report of Select Comm. *July* 22 (No. 207)
. Committee *July* 26, 678 (No. 208)
Report * *July* 27
. Moved, " That the Bill be now read 3ª " *July* 29, 889 ; after short debate, Bill read 3ª ; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons
c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 249]
. Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendts. reported *August* 2, 1125 ; after short debate, Reasons agreed to ; to be communicated to the Lords
. *l.* Commons' Amendts. considered *August* 5, 1284 ; after short debate, on Question ? agreed to
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 71]

Bankrupt Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 12 (No. 30)

BARING, Mr. T., *Huntingdon*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1409
Canada—Railway Loan, Res. [197] 1450
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1444
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.) [195] 614

BARNETT, Mr. H., *Woodstock*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry, [196] 1576
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 789 ; Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1406
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 827 ; *cl.* 4, 841

[*cont.*

Barnett, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Financial Statement—Assessed Taxes, [195] 478
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* (D) 12, [197] 579
Life Assurance Companies, Leave, [194] 586
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 987
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 590; —(Customs and Excise Duties), Res. 2, [196] 797

Barrow, Mr. W. H., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 88, [196] 1606; *cl.* 130, [197] 321; *add. cl.* 417
County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 612
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 763
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 798
Sunday and Ragged Schools, 2R. [196] 1972
Ways and Means—(Customs and Excise Duties), Res. 2, [196] 787, 796

Barttelot, Colonel W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 831
Army—Committee on New Arms, [198] 493
Examinations for Commissions, [194] 629
Army Estimates—Buildings and Repairs, [195] 670
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 531; Consid. Amendt. 1084, 1088
Bankruptcy, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 420
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [194] 1467
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 439; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1291; *cl.* 27, 1292
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 567
Inclosure Act, Motion for a Committee, [195] 1287
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1036; *cl.* 32, [196] 35; *cl.* 39, 265, 269
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Instruction, Motion for Adjournment, [197] 469
Metropolis—St. Luke's Hospital, [195] 677
St. Pancras Workhouse, [197] 1754
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. Amendt. [198] 633
Supply—Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1704
Public Buildings, [197] 676
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 592; —(Customs and Excise Duties), Res. 2, [196] 798

Bass, Mr. M. A., *Staffordshire, E.*
Deanery of Lichfield and Rectory of Tatenhill, [194] 833
Newspapers and the British Museum, [195] 1463

Basses Lights (Ceylon) Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Grant Duff*)

c. Resolution in Committee *July* 16
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 19 [Bill 224]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Considered * *July* 31
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 3 (No. 254)
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 77]

Bateman, Lord
Irish Church, [196] 1578, 1580

Bateson, Sir T., *Devizes*
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Cullen, Cardinal, and the Privy Council, [194] 483
Fenian Convict Mackey, [194] 953
Portadown, Riots at, [197] 1665
State of, [195] 2028
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, [195] 1607
Party Processions (Ireland), [197] 1172
Valentia, Living of, [194] 482

Bath, Marquess of
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1352
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1533
State of, [195] 1954
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 898; Commons' Amendts. [198] 319
Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1571

Baxter, Mr. W. E. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Montrose, &c.*
Navy—Admiralty Contractors, [198] 897
Coal for the, [196] 879
Lime Juice, Pure, [198] 1292
Naval Contracts, [198] 635

Bayswater Market and Baths Bill (*by Order*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 3, [194] 540
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Thomas Chambers*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and negatived; words added; Bill put off for six months

Bazley, Mr. T., *Manchester*
Assessed Rates, Consid. [197] 1087
Board of Trade Returns, [198] 705
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 774; Comm. [195] 221
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1349
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007
Mail Contracts, Res. [196] 1138
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 646
Post Office—Mail Contracts, [194] 716; Motion for a Committee, 1286
Spain—Treaty of Commerce, [197] 1425
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [198] 1001
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 623

Beach, Sir M. E. **Hicks-**, *Gloucestershire, E.*
Army Estimates—Militia, &c. [196] 1573, 1575
Assessed Rates, [194] 556; 2R. [196] 1316, 1321; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 369; Amendt. 385, 389, 395, 396, 397, 398; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 529; *add. cl.* 534; Consid. 1085, 1086, 1088, 1089, 1104
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1817

[*cont.*

Beach, Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
- Inclosure Act, Motion for a Committee, [195] 1287
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 28; *cl.* 59, 414, 419
- Militia, Comm. [195] 1417
- Parliament—Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2070
- Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 528
- Police Superannuations, [195] 1695
- Poor Law—Gilbert Unions, [195] 1195
- Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 335
- Ryde, Borough of, [196] 1632
- Supply—Poor Law Commission, [197] 1686, 1692
- Vagrancy, [198] 156

Beach, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
- Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 833
- Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 506
- Ryde, Borough of, [196] 1631

Beauchamp, Earl
- Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. Amendt. [198] 1081; 3R. 1288
- Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [197] 1880; *cl.* 30, 1883
- Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [194] 1337; *cl.* 14, 1341
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [197] 1141; Report, 1495
- Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 409

Beaumont, Capt. F. E. B., *Durham, S.*
- Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1436
- Army—Fortifications, &c. [196] 1570
  - Moncrieff Gun Carriages, [198] 895
  - Spithead Forts, [198] 1089
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1008

Beaumont, Mr. H. F., *Yorkshire, W. R. S. Div.*
- Betting Houses, [196] 261
- Fire Insurance Duty, [197] 1168
- Sheriffs (York County), [196] 1208

Beaumont, Mr. Somerset A., *Wakefield*
- Mexico—Relations with, [197] 119

Beerhouses, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Headlam*)
- *c.* Acts read; considered in Committee; after short debate, a Resolution agreed to *Feb* 26, [194] 403; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 22]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 27, [195] 1763
- After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Robert Clifton*); A. None, N. 232; M. 232; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
- Committee *; Report *May* 11 [Bill 116]
- Re-comm. *; Report *May* 27
- Considered * *June* 1 [Bill 141]
- Read 3° * *June* 7

[*cont.*

Beerhouses, &c. Bill—cont.
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *June* 8
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 11, [196] 1583; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 122)
- Committee * *June* 22 (No. 145)
- Report * *June* 24
- Read 3ª * *July* 5
- Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 27]

Belper, Lord
- Education, Public, [194] 823

Benefit Building Societies Regulation Bill (*Mr. Gourley, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Stevenson*)
- *c.* Ordered * *August* 3
- Read 1° * *August* 4 [Bill 262]

Bentall, Mr. E. H., *Maldon*
- Canada—Patent Law, [198] 1292
- Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Comm. Res. [198] 1516

Bentinck, Mr. G. A. F. Cavendish-*Whitehaven*
- Courts of Justice, New, [196] 1209, 1496
- Edmunds' Scandal, The, [196] 469
- False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 734
- Fisheries, English, [194] 207
- French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 348
- Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham), 2R. [194] 1894
- Ireland—Church Property, [194] 1351
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1031; *cl.* 12, 1109, 1115; *cl.* 14, 1374; *cl.* 15, 1402; *cl.* 16, 1408, 1410; *cl.* 22, 1512; *cl.* 25, 1602; *cl.* 39, Motion for reporting Progress, [196] 345, 346; Consid. *add. cl.* 751, 757; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1962, 1963
- Metropolis—Local Management of the, [194] 206
- Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. Amendt. [196] 1951, 1959
- Parliament—Morning Sittings, [197] 1184
  - Rules of Debate, [194] 1467
- Spain—"Tornado," Case of the, [194] 836; [196] 742, 1499
- Supply—Board of Manufactures (Scotland), [198] 507
  - British Museum, [198] 221, 225, 226
  - Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 678
  - Houses of Parliament, [197] 681, 684; Report, 1430
  - Learned Societies, [198] 505
  - National Gallery, [198] 498, 500, 501, 503
  - Post Office, [198] 997, 1001
  - Public Offices Site, [197] 1207
  - Report, [198] 686, 689
  - Royal Parks, [197] 655, 656
- University Tests, 2R. [194] 1451; Comm. [197] 767, 788; *cl.* 6, 793

Betting Houses—Suppression of
- Question, Mr. H. F. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 6, [196] 261; Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 24, [197] 514

Beverley Election—Joint Address for a Commission

Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. Attorney General*) *April* 9, [195] 559

After short debate, Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "the issue of a Commission be deferred until an opportunity be afforded for an inquiry by the Select Committee on Parliamentary and Municipal Elections now sitting" (*Colonel Stuart Knox*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after further short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to

Address agreed to *June* 8

Her Majesty's Answer reported *June* 21

Bewdley Writ

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown, to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Burgess to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Bewdley, in the room of Sir Richard Atwood Glass, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Noel*) *Mar* 4, [194] 663

Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Writ for the Borough of Bewdley be suspended for twelve months" (*Mr. Muntz*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 128, N. 65; M. 63; main Question put, and agreed to

Bills of Exchange

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House it would be a great convenience to the commercial interest if the Stamp Duties on Inland and Foreign Bills of Exchange were assimilated, and if it were permitted to use adhesive stamps for Inland as they are now used for Foreign Bills of Exchange" (*Mr. Muntz*), [197] 140; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Bishops Resignation Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)

197] *l.* Presented; read 1ª* *July* 5 (No. 171)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, 1740; after debate, Bill read 2ª

Committee * *July* 15 (No. 193)

198] Report *July* 19, 146 (No. 201)

Read 3ª* *July* 20

c. Read 1º* *July* 26 [Bill 241]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" (*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*) *August* 2, 1125; after short debate, Bill read 2º

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 5, 1297

After debate, Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Hadfield*), 1306

After further debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 112, N. 26; M. 86; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Bill reported with Amendments, 1316 [Bill 263]

[*cont.*

Bishops Resignation Bill—cont.

Considered * *August* 6

Read 3º* *August* 6

l. Commons' Amendts. (No. 288) considered *August* 9, [198] 1469; after short debate, Commons' Amendts. agreed to, with an Amendment; and Bill, with the Amendments, returned to the Commons

Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 111]

Blake, Mr. J. A., *Waterford City*

Ireland—Questions, &c.
- District Asylums, [198] 684
- Fenian Convict O'Donovan Rossa, [198] 1425
- Fisheries, [197] 571
- Howth Harbour, [197] 947
- Landlord and Tenant, Law of, [194] 353
- Seizure of Fishing Smacks, [197] 948, 949

Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1474; *cl.* 59, [196] 420; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1952

Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [197] 485

Oyster Dredging, [197] 1667

Prisons (Religious Instruction), Motion for Returns, [198] 348

*Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1457, 1490

Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 511
- Poor Law Commission, [197] 1691
- Public Works (Ireland), Salaries, [198] 514; Motion for reporting Progress, 515; Amendt. 742, 746
- Report, [198] 690

Blatcher, William, Case of

Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 18, [194] 1655

Bleachworks Acts—Report of Commissioner

Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 4, [194] 629

Board of Trade Returns of Trade and Navigation

Question, Mr. Pochin; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 12, [195] 575; Observations, Mr. Graves; Reply, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; short debate thereon *July* 26, [198] 697

Parl. P. [4102 1 to 4, 4110 1 to 7, 4138, 4192, 4216]

Bonham-Carter, Mr. J., *Winchester*

Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 849

Friendly Societies, Res. [195] 514

Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1442

Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1385

Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 233

Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 624

Bourke, Hon. R., *Lynn Regis*

Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 54, [196] 1593

Harbours of Refuge, [194] 200

Bourne, Colonel J., *Evesham*

Poor Law—Gilbert Unions, [195] 1196

BOUVERIE, Right Hon. E. P., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 863
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 324
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1309, 1311
Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 869
Coventry Election, [197] 995; Motion for a Committee, 1330, 1333, 1334
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 10, [196] 1749
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 1784
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 5, [198] 1276; *cl.* 6, 1277; *cl.* 10, 1279
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 193, 197; 2R. 582
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1093
  Morning Sittings, [195] 1979
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 836, 1245, 1464
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1539
Salisbury Magistrates, [196] 1618
Scotland—Public Business, [198] 1297
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1443
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 3, [198] 763; *cl.* 4, 768
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1428; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 788; *add. cl.* 1100

BOWRING, Mr. E. A., *Exeter*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 832
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1314; *cl.* 2, 1322
Brentford Magistrates, The, [196] 970
China—Hong Kong—Legislative Council, [198] 153
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1715
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Comm. Res. [198] 1516
Supply—Board of Trade, [197] 1680
  Consular Services, [198] 952
  Foreign Office, [197] 1677
  House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476
  Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 514
  Patent Office, [197] 1686
  Portland Harbour, [197] 1457
  Public Buildings, [197] 674
  Public Offices Site, [197] 1200
  Royal Parks, &c. [197] 654, 658
  Science and Art Department, [198] 214
  Superannuation and Retired Allowances, [198] 962
  Works, &c. [197] 1708
United States—Consulate at Chicago, [198] 1293
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 791

BRADY, Mr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
Army—Macloughlin, Case of Dr., [198] 896
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 486, 499
Sunday Trading, 2R. [194] 561; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [195] 800

BRAND, Rt. Hon. H. B. W., *Cambridgeshire*
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1927

BRAND, Mr. H. R., *Hertfordshire*
Army—Colonels' Pay, [195] 1362
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1531, 1535

BRASSEY, Mr. T., *Hastings*
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1357

Brazilian Slave Trade Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Clarendon*)
194] *l.* Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 25 (No. 14)
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 2, 471; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
. Committee; Report, after short debate *Mar* 4, 620
. Read 3ª, after short debate *Mar* 8, 825
c. Read 1º* *Mar* 17 [Bill 58]
Read 2º* *Mar* 19
Committee*; Report *Mar* 22
Read 3º* *Mar* 23
Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 2]

BREWER, Dr. W., *Colchester*
Army—Soldiers' Employment, [198] 1087
Assessed Rates, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 536
Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 563
Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 543
Colne Fishery, [198] 1493
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 54, Amendt. [197] 1529; *cl.* 67, 1537; *add. cl.* 1773, 1774
County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 612
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 11, [198] 1280
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1797
Irish Church, Consid. [196] 770
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 302
Metropolis — St. Pancras Workhouse, [197] 1820
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 344; Comm. *add. cl.* 1057; Consid. 1133
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1356
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 556
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1955
National Gallery, The, [195] 975
Navy Estimates—New Works, [195] 216
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 665
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 59 (E), [198] 1444; 3R. 1496
Pharmacy Act Amendment, Leave, [194] 683; Comm. Amendt. [195] 1933, 1934
Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 182
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1589
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [194] 994
Still-born Children, [197] 1819
Supply—Learned Societies, [198] 505
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 4, [198] 770
Union of Parishes in Westminster, [198] 1145
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [197] 1482

Bridges, Repairs of
Question, Sir Herbert Croft; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *July* 15, [197] 1886

Bridgwater Election
Question, Mr. Langton ; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 23, [194] 2000
Joint Address for a Commission, Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. Attorney General*) *April* 1, [195] 25; Motion agreed to
l. Address agreed to *June* 8, [196] 1391
Her Majesty's Answer reported *June* 21
Minutes of Evidence—(*Parl. P.* No. 65)

Bright, Mr., Letter of—(Irish Church Bill)
Notice, Lord Cairns *June* 15, [196] 1794; Question, Lord Cairns ; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 17, [197] 1 ; Question, Colonel North ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone, 121

BRIGHT, Right Hon. John (President of the Board of Trade), *Birmingham*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [195] 753
Agricultural Statistics, [194] 2001, 2002 ; [196] 943
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 506
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 326 ; 2R. [196] 1329
Cardiff Docks, Accidents in the, [194] 739
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1360
False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 731
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 339
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1735
Harbours of Refuge, [194] 200
Herne Bay Oyster Company, [194] 408, 838
Ireland—State of, [195] 2009, 2013
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1876, 2068, 2088, 2096 ; Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1861 ; *cl.* 39, [196] 290, 306 ; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1929, 1979 ; [198] 86, 119
Light Dues, Res. [196] 177
Lighthouse Accounts, [196] 1206
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1312, 1315 ; Instruction, [197] 468
Mercantile Marine, [194] 156
Merchant Seamen, Diet of, [194] 1463
Metric System of Weights and Measures, [195] 973
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 301
Metropolitan Railways, Smoking on, [195] 1580
Metropolitan Street Tramways, Consid. *add. cl.* [196] 739
Oyster Dredging, [197] 1667
Packet Service between England and France, [198] 155
Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 1473
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1384 ; *cl.* 66, 1447
Patent Laws, [198] 1090
Pilotage Dues on Foreign Shipping, [196] 468
Preston Railway Station, [196] 1494
Railways—Questions, &c.
  Accident at Abergele, [196] 944
  Accidents at the Swindon Station, [194] 1656
  Guards' and Passengers' Communication, [194] 1903 ; [195] 29 ; [196] 1243 ; [198] 1088, 1089
  Liabilities of Railway Companies, [198] 1436, 1439
  Signalling, [198] 1372
[*cont.*

BRIGHT, Right Hon. John—*cont.*
Rule of the Road at Sea, [194] 371 ; [195] 1465
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1275, 1277, 1279
Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [194] 110 ; [195] 360
Sea Fishing Boats, [195] 1465
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1929
South Eastern Railway, [197] 355
Trade Returns, [195] 575
Waterloo and Whitehall Railway, [195] 972

BRIGHT, Mr. Jacob, *Manchester*
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1246
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A), 12, [196] 1764
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 668, 670
Supply—Science and Art Department, [198] 210

BRIGHT, Mr. R., *Somersetshire, E.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 20, [195] 1498

BRISCOE, Mr. J. I., *Surrey, W.*
Supply—Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 952

BRISE, Colonel S. B. RUGGLES-, *Essex, E.*
Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 606
Agricultural Returns, Res. [195] 755
Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 140
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1167
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 682 ; 2R. [195] 442
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1740
Militia, Comm. [195] 1418
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 53, [197] 1483
Visitation Fees, [195] 1196

British Columbia
Motion for Address for "any Papers on the Union of British Columbia with the Dominion of Canada" (*Sir Harry Verney*) *June* 1, [196] 1098 ; after debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 390)
Telegraphic Communication with, Question, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Feb* 25, [194] 309

British Museum
Newspapers, Question, Mr. A. Bass ; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *April* 23, [195] 1463
Temple Collection, The, Question, Mr. W. Lowther ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 26, [195] 1579
Accounts—(*Parl. P.* No. 211)
(See SUPPLY)

BROCKLEHURST, Mr. W. C., *Macclesfield*
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 337

Brodrick, Hon. W., *Surrey, Mid.*
- Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 424
- Ireland, State of, [195] 2037
- Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1721 ; Comm. *cl.* 16, [195] 1405 ; *cl.* 27, 1639 ; *cl.* 32, Amendt. [196] 43
- Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 256
- Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 180

Brogden, Mr. A., *Wednesbury*
- Civil Service Pensions, Comm. *cl.* 3, Motion for reporting Progress, [196] 872
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 926
- Post Office — Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 930
- Supply — Furniture, Public Departments, Amendt. [197] 676
  - House of Commons Offices, [197] 1478
  - Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1705
  - Public Buildings, [197] 675

Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Adam*)
- *c.* Ordered ; read 1° * *August* 2 [Bill 254]
- Read 2° * *August* 5
- Committee * ; Report *August* 6
- Considered * *August* 7
- Read 3° * *August* 7
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *August* 7 (No. 294)
- Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived *August* 9
- Read 3ª * *August* 10
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. clviii.]

Bruce, Right Hon. H. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Renfrewshire*
- Accidents in Mines, [198] 686
- Agricultural Labour Commission, [194] 484
- Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 601
- Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 864
- Barking Sewage Outfall, [196] 260, 1402 ; —Mortality at, [197] 515
- Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [195] 1778
- Betting Houses, [196] 261 ; [197] 514
- Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 565
- Blatcher, William, Case of, [194] 1655
- Bleachworks Act, [194] 630
- Brentford Magistrates, The, [196] 970
- Cabs and Omnibuses, Licenses on, [198] 1541
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 848, 868, 995
- Capital Sentences, Remission of, [195] 1358
- Cardiff Docks, Accidents in the, [194] 743
- Church Rates—Private Acts, [195] 1854
- Clerks to Magistrates, [196] 1238 ; Explanation, 1299
- Coal Fields, Motion for an Address, [196] 1914
- Coal Mines, Accidents in, [195] 359 ; Motion for Papers, [198] 1520
  - Regulation of, [195] 844
  - Reports of Inspectors, [194] 1089
- Colne Fishery, [198] 1493
- Constabulary Returns, [195] 1850
- Contagious Diseases Act, Motion for a Committee, [196] 808

[*cont.*

Bruce, Right Hon. H. A.—*cont.*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [194] 1039 ; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1290 ; *cl.* 70, 1757
- County Coroners, Leave, [195] 753
- County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 617
- Crime Prevention, [194] 164
- Criminal Law—Assize Sentences on Criminals, [198] 1373, 1530
  - Bell, James, Case of, [198] 1295
  - Convict Richard Bonner, [194] 162
  - Convict George Roberts, [194] 161
  - Convict Wiltshire, [195] 1700
  - Conviction of three Children at Salisbury, [195] 675 ; [196] 1615
  - Criminal Classes, The, [194] 149
  - Liberation of Sir Eardley Eardley, [195] 1200
- Election Petitions, Judgments on, [194] 409
- Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1325
- Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture, [195] 678
- Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1409 ; Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1769 ; *cl.* 29, 1777
- Factory Acts—Hours of Labour, [195] 1851 ; [198] 683
- Factory Returns, [194] 202
- Fever Patients, Conveyance of, [194] 411
- Fisheries, English, [194] 90, 94, 207
- Foreign Office Agencies, [198] 1534
- Friendly Societies, Res. [195] 515
- Friendly Societies Acts, [198] 896
- Friendly Societies Returns, [197] 571
- Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 1783
- 198] Habitual Criminals, Comm. 1253, 1260, 1264, 1270 ; *cl.* 4, 1274 ; Amendt. 1274, 1275 ; *cl.* 5, 1275, 1276 ; *cl.* 6, 1276, 1277 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1277, 1278 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1278 ; *cl.* 10, 1279 ; *cl.* 11, 1279, 1280, 1281 ; *cl.* 12, 1281, 1368, 1369
- Hammersmith Bridge—University Boat Race, [194] 641, 1467
- Herts Constabulary, [198] 1086
- Hounslow Powder Mills, [197] 515, 1169
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 395
- Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 763
- Imprisonment for Debt—Arrest of a Young Girl, [194] 112, 209
- Inclosure Act, Motion for a Comm. [195] 1287
- Inclosure of Lands, 3R. [195] 555, 679
- Infanticide, [198] 1143
- Ireland—O'Donovan Rossa, Case of, [196] 1239 ; [198] 1424, 1428
- Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [198] 1210
- Jersey Jurats, [197] 945
- Judicature Commission, [196] 1633
- Kenn, John, Case of, [194] 769
- Loan Societies, [194] 1086
- Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1221, 1228, 1229
- Marriage Laws, [198] 1406
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [196] 1450
- Mayors, Removal of, [196] 572
- Medical Education, &c., General Council of, [197] 1270
- Metropolis—Questions, &c.
  - Cab Stands, [197] 1169
  - Cremorne Gardens, [196] 1743
  - Local Management of the, [194] 207
  - Night Houses, [195] 1852

[*cont.*

Bruce, Right Hon. H. A.—*cont.*
St. Luke's Hospital, [195] 677
Semaphore near Palace Yard, [194] 1088, 1655
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1365
Mines, Rating of, [195] 1582
Mold—Riots at, [196] 1296
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1955
Murphy's, Mr., Lectures, [195] 759; [197] 125; —Arrest of, 411, 412, 1543; [198] 613
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 671
Business of the House, [198] 905
Whitsuntide Holidays, [196] 809
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 648, 952, 1546
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 810; *cl.* 2, 829, 835, 836; *cl.* 3, 837, 838, 1095, 1103; *cl.* 4, 1113; *cl.* 9, 1120; *cl.* 24, 1244; Motion for Adjournment, 1246, 1464; 3R. 1498, 1499
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 672, 682
Police Constables, Pay of, [197] 1663
Police Interference, [195] 477
Police Superannuations, [195] 1696
Police, The, and the Public, [198] 562, 563
Pollution of Rivers, [194] 203
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1542
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 805
Prisons (Religious Instruction), Motion for Returns, [198] 349
Public Houses, &c. Res. [197] 457
Reformatory Schools, Juvenile Offenders in, [196] 742
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 822, 823, 980
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 982
Revising Barristers, Appointment of, [198] 1488, 1536, 1541
Ritualistic Processions, [195] 355
Roman Catholic Charities, [195] 1362; Motion for Returns, [198] 1025, 1028
Ryde, Borough of, [196] 1633
Sanitary Acts, [194] 2001
Scotland—Truck System, [197] 1885
Waternish Church, Isle of Skye, [197] 1886; [198] 798
Staines, Burglaries at, [198] 1542
Still-born Children, [197] 1819
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 465
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 801
Supply—General Register Office, [197] 1685
Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1480, 1481, 1482
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 512
Tithe Commission, [197] 1684
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1379
Trades Unions, Funds of, [194] 112, 367
Turnpike Trusts, [194] 484; [196] 16
Visitation Fees, [195] 1197
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 126
Workshops Regulation Act in Birmingham, [195] 583

Bruce, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Ireland—Cork, Mayor of, [196] 103
Derry, Proclamation of, [196] 104, 263; [197] 1667
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 724
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 913; *cl.* 18, 1485, 1487; *cl.* 23, Motion for reporting Progress, 1531; *cl.* 27, 1643; *cl.* 36, [196] 72; *cl.* 39, 267; *cl.* 58, 350; *cl.* 61, Amendt. 420; Consid. Amendt. 778
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1558
Registration (Ireland) Act, [194] 839
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1545

Bruen, Mr. H., *Carlow Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1122; *cl.* 13, 1134, 1136; *cl.* 19, 1494; *cl.* 25, 1600; *cl.* 27, 1646; Consid. [196] 766
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [195] 312

Buccleuch, Duke of
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 52, Amendt. [196] 462
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. Amendt. [195] 1677, 1690
Representative Peers for Scotland — Double Return, [196] 561

Buller, Sir E. M., *Staffordshire, N.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 90, [197] 1541; Amendt. 1755, 1758

Bulwer, Right Hon. Sir H. L., *Tamworth*
Foreign Office Agencies, [198] 1534
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2018; Lords' Amendts. [198] 72
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1505
Supply—Consular Buildings, [197] 1469, 1471, 1472, 1473
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1465, 1467
Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 928, 941, 950
United States — Recent Negotiations with, [197] 1427, 1428

Burials Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Charles Reed, Mr. Henry Richard, Mr. Candlish*)
c. Acts read; considered in Committee; a Resolution agreed to *Mar* 2, [194] 540; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 33]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 3

Burke, Mr. E. Haviland, *Christchurch*
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 952
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 59, [196] 397

Burrell, Sir P., *New Shoreham*
Hyde Park, Furious Riding in, [197] 1592
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 877
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 584

Bury, Viscount, *Berwick-on-Tweed*
  Army—Buckingham Palace Guard Room, Motion for Papers, [197] 137
  Army Estimates — Hospital Establishment, [195] 666
    Martial Law, [195] 662
  Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1526, 1534, 1570
  British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1115, 1128
  Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1233
  Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 577
  Hammersmith Bridge—University Boat Race, [194] 640, 641, 1467
  Hudson's Bay Company, [195] 583
  Light Dues, Res. [196] 158
  Lighthouse Accounts, [196] 1206
  Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 358 ; *cl.* 1, 366
  Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [194] 138
  Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1622
  New Zealand, Affairs of, [198] 456
  Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. Amendt. [195] 278
  Parliament—New Writs, [194] 21
  Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1271
  Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1470
  Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 210, 220, 223

Butler-Johnstone, Mr. H. A., *Canterbury*
  Irish Church, 3R. [196] 1037

Buxton, Mr. C., *Surrey, E.*
  Army Estimates—Martial Law, [195] 662
  Civil Service Appointments, [195] 31
  Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1229
  Egypt—Viceroy of, [196] 1205
  Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol, [198] 1048
  Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [194] 138
  Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1939, 1959
  Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 255
  Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1848
  Regina *v.* Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 987
  Supply—Education, Public, [198] 180

Cadogan, Hon. F. W., *Cricklade*
  Metropolitan Railways, Smoking on, [195] 1579
  Railway Accidents at the Swindon Station, [194] 1656

Cairns, Lord
  Bankruptcy, [194] 100; 2R. [197] 1413 ; Comm. [198] 16, 678
  Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1746
  Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 477 ; Comm. 621, 622 ; 3R. 829, 830
  Bright, Mr., Letter of, [196] 1794 ; [197] 1
  Common Law Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [194] 1460
  Dublin City Election, Address, Amendt. [196] 1394
  Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [198] 1079, 1084 ; Comm. 1138

[*cont.*

Cairns, Lord—*cont.*
  Ecclesiastical Courts, 2R. [195] 838
  Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 8, [197] 1876 ; *cl.* 14, 1878
  Evidence Amendment, 2R. [198] 676 ; Comm. 987 ; *cl.* 2, 988
  Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. [198] 1067 ; *cl.* 16, 1068
  Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 1821, 1836, 1840, 1841 ; Report, [196] 695, 703
  Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 348 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1314, 1315 ; *cl.* 10, 1324, 1326, 1327, 1331 ; *cl.* 13, 1333 ; *cl.* 14, 1343 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. [195] 224, 225
  Hudson's Bay Company, [194] 798
  Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1350
  Ireland—Questions, &c.
    Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1534
    Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 372, 373, 384
    Murders, [194] 1639, 1648
    State of, [195] 1958
196] Irish Church, 1579
197] 2R. 267, 287, 289, 291, 354 ; Comm.
. Preamble, 722 ; *cl.* 2, 744, 752 ; *cl.* 6,
. 753, 754 ; *cl.* 7, 758, 759 ; *cl.* 8, 759 ;
. *cl.* 12, 871 ; Amendt. 872, 873 ; *cl.* 13, 880,
. 885 ; *cl.* 14, 895, 896, 897 ; *cl.* 15, 920, 921 ;
. *cl.* 16, 922 ; *cl.* 23, 935 ; *cl.* 25, 997 ; *cl.* 26,
. Amendt. 998, 999, 1000 ; *cl.* 27, 1009 ; *cl.* 28,
. 1025, 1044, 1056 ; *cl.* 29, 1127, 1144 ; *cl.* 33,
. 1155 ; *cl.* 35, 1158 ; *cl.* 41, 1160, 1162 ;
. *cl.* 68, Amendt. 1228, 1231, 1245 ; *add. cl.*
. 1260 ; *cl.* 69, 1261 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1261,
. 1264, 1266 ; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1267 ; *cl.* 22,
. Amendt. 1268 ; Preamble, Amendt. 1268 ;
. Report, 1485 ; Amendt. 1486, 1487, 1492,
. 1493, 1495 ; Amendt. 1500, 1503, 1504,
. 1509, 1519, 1522, 1523 ; 3R. 1620, 1655
198] Commons Amendts. 243, 244, 258, 260,
. 262, 264, 275, 308, 313, 408, 438
  Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 465 ; 2R. 1676 ; Comm. [196] 1172 ; *cl.* 1, 1203 ; Report, 1385 ; 3R. [197] 1396
  Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 985
  Municipal Franchise, Report, [198] 146
  Newspapers, &c. 2R. [196] 965, 968
  Parliament—Questions, &c.
    Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 39, 104
    Business of the House, [198] 14
    Easter Recess, [194] 798
    Order in the House, [197] 402
  Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 607
  Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1781, 1782 ; [195] 570, 1574, 1575 ; Comm. [196] 437 ; *cl.* 1, 444, 447 ; *cl.* 68, 464 ; *cl.* 70, 466 ; Report, 1284, 1285
  Religious, Educational, &c. Societies Incorporation, 2R. [196] 356 ; Comm. [197] 569
  Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1681, 1693
  Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 571, 572
  Scotland—Hypothec, Law of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1184
  Tenants Purchase by Instalments (Ireland), 2R. [198] 776
  Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1188 ; Comm. 1554, 1558, 1560
  Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 993, 994 ; Comm. 1068, 1069, 1071

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Dundalk*
Ireland—Dundalk and Louth, Proclamation of, [197] 1666
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 814

CAMBRIDGE, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1453
Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1869; *cl.* 13, 1877

CAMERON, Mr. D., *Inverness-shire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [196] 259
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Consid. Amendt. [198] 1457
Scotland—Waternish Church, [198] 798
Shepherds Dogs, Tax on, [197] 947

CAMOYS, Lord
Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. 2R. [198] 890

CAMPBELL, Lord
Parliament—Order in the House, [198] 147

CAMPBELL, Mr. H., *Stirling, &c.*
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 156
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 395
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 800
Supply—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 966
University Tests, Comm. [197] 772, 784

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [198] 1
Naval Stores, 2R. [195] 672, 673
Navy—Armament of Turret Ships, [195] 345, 351, 352; Explanation, 570
University Tests, 2R. [198] 141

Canada—Dominion of
British Columbia, Motion for Address for "any Papers on the Union of British Columbia with the Dominion of Canada" (*Sir Harry Verney*) *June* 1, [196] 1098; after debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 390)
Canadian Boundaries, Question, Observations, Viscount Milton; Reply, Mr. Otway *August* 6, [198] 1440
Dockyard Emigrants, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 27, [195] 1698; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 4, [196] 105; Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 7, 1297 (*Parl. P.* Nos. 196, 354, 403)
Hudson's Bay Company—Cession of Territory, Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Feb* 25, [194] 309; Question, Lord Cairns; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 8, 798; Question, Viscount Bury; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 12, [195] 583; Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 13, 680; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Monsell *June* 10, [196] 1497; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 9, [197] 1526
[*cont.*

Canada, Dominion of—cont.
Intercolonial Railway, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 28, [196] 877
Intercolonial Railway Loan, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "this House is of opinion that the application of money raised under the Imperial guarantee, in pursuance of 'The Canada Railway Loan Act, 1867,' to the redemption of a portion of the debt of the Canadian Dominion is contrary to the intention of that Act; and that no further guarantee should be given by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury under the above Act, except in such form and manner as shall ensure the direct application of the money so guaranteed to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway" (*Mr. Sinclair Aytoun*), [197] 1445; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 272)
Newfoundland, Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 11, [194] 1091
Addresses—*Parl. P.* . . [4198]
Patent Law, Question, Mr. Bentall; Answer, Mr. Monsell; short debate thereon *August* 5, [198] 1292
Reduction of Military Force in, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 13, [196] 747

Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan (Guarantee) Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 30
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *August* 2 [Bill 253]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *August* 5, [198] 1324
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Monk*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 65, N. 10; M. 55; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Considered* *August* 7
Read 3°* *August* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 7 (No. 285)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 101]

CANDLISH, Mr. J., *Sunderland*
Abyssinia—Cost of the War, [196] 106; Motion for a Committee, 1419, 1439
Army Estimates—Superannuation Allowances, [197] 149, 150
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 378, 397; *cl.* 4, 526; *add. cl.* 536; Consid. 1088
Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 626
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1216; *cl.* 13, 1221; *cl.* 130, [197] 317
Board of Trade Returns, [198] 706
Cardiff Docks, Accidents in the, [194] 738
Ceylon—Basses Lights, [198] 563
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. *cl.* 3, [196] 872
[*cont.*

Candlish, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 843
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 19, Amendt. [196] 1768; *cl.* 41, 1782
Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866, [197] 1192
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [195] 1711
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 175
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1026 ; *cl.* 20, 1498 ; *cl.* 59, [196] 402
Light Dues, Res. [196] 182
Mercantile Marine, [194] 156
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Comm. Res. [198] 1511
Metropolis—New Public Offices, [197] 1672
Navy—Lime Juice, Pure, [198] 1291
Naval Contracts, [198] 642
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [195] 187
Salaries, [195] 83
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 582
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1383
Pilotage Dues on Foreign Shipping, [196] 468
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [196] 1147
Post Office—West India Mails, [195] 841
Prisons (Religious Instruction), Motion for Returns, [198] 349
Rateable Property, Leave, [194] 185
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 979
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 466
Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [197] 1210
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1464
Foreign Office, [197] 1677
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 678
General Register Office, [197] 1684
Houses of Parliament, [197] 680
Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1212
Lighthouses Abroad, [197] 1463
Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 946
Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1705
Public Buildings, Amendt. [197] 675
Public Offices Site, [197] 1207
Public Works (Ireland), Amendt. [197] 1460
Rates on Government Property, [197] 1458
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 663
Stationery Office, [197] 1695
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 427 ;—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 801

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 5, 8
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1740, 1744, 1747 ; Report, [198] 147
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1353
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations, 2R. [195] 1820
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1332
196] Irish Church, 2R. 1707
197] Comm. Preamble, 728 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 743 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 753 ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 870, 873 ; *cl.* 13, 883, 885 ; *cl.* 25, 998 ; *cl.* 28, 1077 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1110, 1119, 1128 ; Report, Amendt. 1514, 1518, 1521 ; 3R. 1618
198] Commons' Amendts. 416
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 20, [196] 457

Cape Colony
Boers of the Transvaal Republic, Question, Mr. R. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 7, [197] 1342
Despatches—*Parl. P.* [4040]
Enslavement of Kaffir Children, Question, Mr. R. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Monsell ; short debate thereon *Feb* 19, [194] 128
Correspondence—*Parl. P.* [4141]

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. M'Laren, Sir John Gray*)
c. Ordered* *April* 9
Read 1°* *April* 12 [Bill 71]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 28, [198] 840
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. J. D. Lewis*) ; after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 58, N. 118 ; M. 60 ; words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; Bill put off for three months

Cardiff Docks, Accidents in the
Observations, Mr. Candlish ; Reply, Colonel Stuart, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 5, [194] 738

Cardwell, Right Hon. E. (Secretary of State for War), *Oxford City*
Army—Questions, &c.
Allowances to Troops in China and Japan, [194] 1463
Armament of Sea and Land Defences, [197] 142
Ball Ammunition, Possession of, [198] 1292
Branding Deserters, [196] 101, 573
Cadastral Survey, [194] 1999
Camping System, Major M'Gwire's, [197] 944
Canteens, [194] 1464
Cartridge Making, [194] 410
Cavalry Regiments for India, [198] 154
Chaplains, [195] 678
Chelmsford, Rifle Range at, [196] 264
Colonels in the Indian Army, [197] 1888
Colonels' Pay, [195] 1362
Committee on New Arms, [198] 495
Concentration of Army Offices, [195] 1577
Courts Martial, [196] 1495 ; [198] 324
Cupping in the, [195] 1097
Drilling at Aldershot, [198] 156
Examinations for Commissions, [194] 629
Field Days at Aldershot during Hot Weather, [198] 455
Fines for Drunkenness, [196] 1296
Fortifications, Expenditure on, [195] 232, 233 ; [196] 1572
Government of the, [194] 203
Gunpowder Magazines at Upnor, [197] 1168
Household Cavalry, [196] 572
India—Rifles for, [194] 1653
Japan, Officers of the Army in, [198] 904
Lunatics — Murder of Sergeant Barnes, [195] 1576
Military Appointments, [194] 355
Military Labour, [198] 685
Military Train, [195] 1200
Militia Officers, [196] 749

[*cont.*

Cardwell, Right Hon. E. —*cont.*
- Militia Quartermasters, [194] 631
- Moncrieff Gun Carriages, [198] 895
- New Zealand War Medal, [194] 352
- Non-Purchase Corps, Promotion in, [198] 995
- Ordnance Survey, [195] 1974 ; [197] 946
- Retirement of Officers, [195] 1095
- Rintoul, Captain, Case of, [196] 389
- Royal Horse Artillery, [197] 359
- Saltpetre, Storage of, [195] 1584
- Snider Rifle, [194] 2002
- Soldiers Employment, [198] 1087
- Spithead Forts, [198] 1089
- 3rd West India Regiment, [194] 1789
- Volunteer Capitation Grant, [196] 1299
- West Kent Militia, [195] 679
- Whitworth Gun, [194] 1660
- Wightman, Ensign, Case of, [196] 388
- Yeomanry Cavalry, [194] 159

Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 139
Army—Clerks of the Works and Royal Engineers, Res. [197] 136
Army—Military Labour, Res. [195] 658
Army—Militia and Reserve Forces, Motion for Returns, [195] 1761
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1535
Army—War Office and Horse Guards, [194] 625 ; Res. 1105
Army Estimates—Army Administration, [197] 145
- Building and Repairs, [195] 669, 670
- Hospital Establishment, [195] 666
- Land Forces, [194] 1111, 1140, 1145, 1173
- Martial Law, [195] 663, 666
- Military Education, [197] 143, 147
- Military Stores, [195] 668, 669
- Militia, &c. [195] 667 ; [196] 1574
- Superannuation Allowances, [197] 149, 150
- Yeomanry, [196] 1577

Canada—Reduction of Forces, [196] 747, 748
Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1332
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), Comm. [195] 221
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1005 ; *cl.* 1, 1009
Government Reductions and Emigration, [195] 992
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1791, 1792
Irish Church, 3R. [196] 996
Militia, Leave, [195] 941 ; Comm. 1418 ; 3R. 1532
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [195] 95
Navy—Naval Contracts, [198] 648
Royal Patriotic Fund, [194] 1465 ; [195] 1583; [196] 469
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 465
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 513, 514
Treasury Board, Constitution of the, [194] 860

Carnarvon, Earl of

Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1743, 1744
Ecclesiastical Courts, 2R. [195] 834
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 618
Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 703 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1312, 1315 ; *cl.* 6, 1319 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1341, 1343
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1336, 1340

[*cont.*

Carnarvon, Earl of—*cont.*

Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 368
- State of, [195] 1969

Irish Church, [196] 1579 ; 2R. 1717 ; [197] 36 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 746 ; *cl.* 14, 914 ; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 924 ; Report, Amendt. 1484, 1486 ; 3R. 1621 ; Commons' Amendts. [198] 422
Life Peerages, Comm. [196] 1179
New Zealand, [198] 778, 786, 794
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 4, 13
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 403, 405
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 619
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 967
University Tests, 2R. Previous Question moved, [198] 127

Carnegie, Hon. C., *Forfarshire*

Army Estimates—Martial Law, [195] 663
Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [194] 352
Cattle Plague (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1810
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1532 ; *cl.* 90, 1757
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 632
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), Leave, [194] 112 ; 2R. [196] 244, 253 ; [198] 393
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 361
Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 195
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1734

Carter, Mr. R. M., *Leeds*

Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1251
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 538
Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1461
- Rates for Government Property, [197] 1459
- Royal Parks, &c. [197] 664

Cartwright, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*

Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture, [194] 1355

Carysfort, Earl of

Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 27

Cashel Election—Joint Address for a Commission

Question, Lord Edwin Hill-Trevor ; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 16, [195] 976
Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *April* 29, 1935 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
l. Address agreed to *June* 8
Her Majesty's Answer reported *June* 21
- Minutes of Evidence—(*Parl. P.* No. 121)

Cattle Plague
Cheshire, Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the distress occasioned by the Cattle Plague to the Ratepayers of the county of Chester entitles them to the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to some remission of the heavy debt incurred for the amount of compensation" (*Earl Grosvenor*) *July* 13, [197] 1807; after debate, Question put; A. 85, N. 126; M. 41
Foot and Mouth Disease, Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *August* 4, [198] 1252
Germany, Outbreak of Rinderpest in, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Feb* 23, [194] 207
194] *Importation of Diseased Foreign Sheep and Cattle*, Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Feb* 22, 154; Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Feb* 23, 205; Question, Mr. Carnegie; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Feb* 26, 352; Question, Lord R. Montagu; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster
195] *April* 22, 1363; *April* 23, 1467; Questions, Mr. Corrance; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *April* 27, 1696; Question, Mr. A. Johnston; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *July* 1, [197] 949
Report—(*Parl. P.* No. 320)
Live Stock, Carriage of, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 4, [194] 630
Metropolitan Cattle Market, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *May* 3, [196] 15
Roumania, Cattle Plague in, Question, Mr. Turnor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *July* 2, [197] 1081 (*Parl. P.* No. 222)
Orders of Council—(*Parl. P.* No. 76)
(See *Contagious Diseases* (*Animals*) *Bill*)

CAVE, Right Hon. S., *New Shoreham*
Bank of England—Payment of Dividends, [196] 263
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1216; *cl.* 7, 1218; *cl.* 46, 1405; *cl.* 88, 1606; *cl.* 126, 1904; *cl.* 130, [197] 317
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1776
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1784
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 124
Life Assurance Companies, Leave, [194] 585
Light Dues, Res. [196] 167
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 616

CAVENDISH, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 592
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 506
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1510

CAVENDISH, Lord G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 327
Dean and Chapter of Lichfield, Estates of, [195] 676
Irish Church—Lords Amendts. [198] 57

CAWLEY, Mr. C. E., *Salford*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 377, 394; *cl.* 5, 532, 533
197] Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 64, 1535; *cl.* 67, Amendt. *ib.* 1539; *cl.* 73, Amendt. 1540, 1541; *cl.* 90, 1758; *cl.* 96, Amendt. 1762; *cl.* 98, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 99, Amendt. 1763
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1773
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1817
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 41; *cl.* 39, 135; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1934
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 655
Savings Banks, [195] 1581
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [197] 1459
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 666; Amendt. 673

CECIL, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, W.*
Army—Chelmsford, Rifle Range at, [196] 263
Field Days at Aldershot during Hot Weather, [198] 454, 455
False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 718
Navy—Coastguardsmen, [198] 453
Sanitary Acts, [194] 2000

CHADWICK, Mr. D., *Macclesfield*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 397; *add. cl.* 534; Consid. Amendt. 1084, 1086, 1087
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1817
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 681; 2R. [195] 446; Comm. *cl.* 101, [197] 1764; 3R. [198] 520
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 338
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1515

CHAMBERS, Mr. M., *Devonport*
Army—Clerks of the Works and Royal Engineers, Res. [197] 134
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 13, [196] 1220; *cl.* 59, 1605; *add. cl.* [197] 417
Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 542
County Courts, 2R. [196] 687
Diplomatic Salaries, &c. Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1337
Navy—Government Dockyards, Reductions in, [194] 378
Parliament—Decoration of Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 719

CHAMBERS, Mr. T., *Marylebone*
Bayswater Market and Baths, 2R. Amendt. [194] 540
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1568
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. [196] 1744, 1745; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1748, 1749; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1765
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1267; *cl.* 10, 1279; *cl.* 11, 1280
Inclosure of Lands, [194] 1905
India—Jhansi Prize Money, [194] 1466
Land, Transfer of, [194] 2000
Libel, 2R. [194] 1609
Lord's Day Society—Petition Forgeries—Explanation, [196] 1916
Marlborough Street Police Court—Motion for Papers, [198] 1227

[*cont.*

CHAMBERS, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Leave, [194] 331 ; 2R. [195] 1288, 1324 ; Comm. [196] 1450 ; Instruction, [197] 467, 470 ; [198] 357 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 365, 366
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 300
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 344 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 1057
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 625
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1276
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1093 ; [198] 1092
Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 190
Poor Law (Removal of Children), Res. [197] 1334, 1340
Rateable Property (Ireland), Leave, [194] 182
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 799, 800
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 640
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 125

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord HATHERLEY)
Bankruptcy, [194] 95 ; 2R. [197] 1403, 1416 ; Comm. [198] 15, 17, 679, 681 ; 3R. 889 ; Commons' Amendts. 1284
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1747 ; Commons' Amendts. [198] 1469
Charity Commissioners, 2R. [197] 1748
Common Law Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [194] 1460 ; 3R. [195] 340
Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds, 2R. [198] 1063
Dublin City Election, Address, [196] 1400
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [198] 1084
Election Inquiries — Reports of the Judges, [196] 1294, 1391
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 1878
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [198] 677
Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 1829
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1324, 1326 ; *cl.* 14, 1343 ; Report, *cl.* 10, [195] 226
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1349
Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 383, 384
197] Irish Church, 2R. 247 ; *cl.* 7, 755, 756, 759 ; *cl.* 8, *ib.* ; *cl.* 13, 874, 881 ; *cl.* 14, 914 ; *cl.* 15, 920 ; *cl.* 16, 923 ; *cl.* 25, 998 ; *cl.* 29, 1117, 1119, 1149 ; *cl.* 19, 1266 ; *cl.* 21, 1267 ; Report, 1493, 1495, 1501, 1522 ; 3R. 1622
198] Commons' Amendts. 312, 314, 316
Life Peerages, Motion for an Address, [196] 11
Lodgers' Property Protection, 2R. [196] 563
Marriage Law Commission Report, [195] 137
Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 984
Municipal Magistrates, Removal of, [196] 1093
Newspapers, &c. 2R. [196] 967, 968
Parliament—Opening of the Session, [194] 1, 2, 3, 14
Order in the House, [197] 408
Queen's Speech, The, [194] 24
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 614
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Report, [196] 1286
Religious, Educational, &c. Societies Incorporation, 2R. [196] 355 ; Comm. [197] 568
Representative Peers for Scotland — Double Return, [196] 562
[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR, The LORD—*cont.*
Speaker, Presentation of the, [194] 11, 12
Special Bails, 2R. [197] 1749
St. Katherine's Hospital, [195] 1947
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1191 ; Comm. 1561
Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 993, 994 ; Comm. 1069, 1070
Wiltes Peerage, Report, [196] 427

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. R. LOWE), *London University*
Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 110, 641, 646, 647
Cost of the War, [196] 106
Assessed Taxes, Collection of, [194] 1087
Assessed Tax Papers, [198] 1251
Bank of England — Payment of Dividends, [196] 263
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 318 ; *cl.* 131, 415
Bills of Exchange, Res. [197] 141
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1812
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 486
Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 544
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [196] 873, 874
Clerks of Local Commissioners of Taxes, [196] 1208
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [198] 1282
Copyhold, Inclosure, and Charity Commissions, [195] 141
Corn, Duty on, [195] 585, 844
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1254, 1270
Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 555, 557, 559, 1496 ; [198] 1529
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 818, 824, 828 ; *cl.* 1, 841 ; *cl.* 4, 843 ; *cl.* 11, 845 ; *cl.* 18, 849, 850, 852 ; *cl.* 19, *ib.* ; *cl.* 26, 854 ; *cl.* 36, 855 ; *add. cl.* 857
Dagenham Dock Company, [198] 1371
Faraday, Proposed Monument to, [197] 1173
Fire Insurance, [196] 574 ; [197] 1168
Fire Insurances, Res. [195] 306
Gold Coinage, [198] 1411, 1422, 1532, 1534
Melting of English Sovereigns, [198] 1527
Horses, Tax on, [195] 1098
House Tax, Res. [197] 1805
Income and Assessed Taxes, Payment of, [195] 843 ; [197] 123
Income Tax, Res. [194] 1532
Ireland—Hackney Carriages in Dublin, [195] 583, 584
Loans to Dublin and Belfast, [197] 125
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1978
Libel, 2R. [195] 757
Licence Duties on Servants, [195] 1850
Light Dues, Res. [196] 171
Malt Duties, [194] 626 ; [198] 1247
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 338 ; Consid. 1133
Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [197] 481
National Debt, Res. [198] 1213
Nomenclature of Diseases, [194] 1789
Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 847
Poor Law, Res. [197] 441, 443
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1528
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 253
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, [194] 1187 ; Motion for a Committee, 1305, 1306
[*cont.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*cont.*
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 819
Prosecutions, Cost of, [196] 811
Real Property, Res. [196] 598
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1577
Savings Banks, [195] 1581, 1582
Scotland—Income Tax, [196] 390, 471
Shepherds Dogs, Tax on, [197] 947
Stamp Acts, Consolidation of the, [195] 30
Stamp Duties Exemption, [195] 1849
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 464, 466
Supply — Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 641, 646, 647, 773
Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1443
Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1212
Land Registry Office, [198] 909
Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 945, 947
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 670
Treasury, &c. Departments, [197] 1478
Taxes, Collection of, [194] 767
Taxes on Servants, [196] 1097, 1098
Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 4, [198] 767
Telegraphs and Railway Companies, [196] 1299
Treasury Board, Constitution of the, [194] 847, 854
195] Ways and Means—Financial Statement, 363
. 408, 430, 433, 584; Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), 586,
. 593, 596, 598, 599; Motion for reporting
. Progress, 601, 605, 613, 625, 640—Res. 2,
196] (Customs and Excise Duties), 793, 796, 797,
. 798, 799; Amendt. 800, 802, 803, 804, 805,
. 806, 807

Chaplin, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1287
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [195] 1899

Charity Commissioners Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 5 (No. 170)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, [197] 1748; Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 20
Read 3ª * *July* 22
c. Read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 239]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee *—R.P. *August* 5
Committee *—R.P. *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Considered * *August* 7
Considered * *August* 9
Read 3° * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 110]

Charley, Mr. W. T., *Salford*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 7, [197] 1768
Coronation Oath, The, [198] 906
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 852; *add. cl.* 856, 857
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 961
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1395, 1657
Ireland — Impropriate Tithe Rent Charge, [195] 1974
Lavelle *v.* Proudfoot, Case of, [196] 881
[*cont.*

Charley, Mr. W. T.—*cont.*
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1285
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1949; Comm. [195] 896; *cl.* 10, 1107; *cl.* 12, 1111, 1123; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1126, 1136; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1407, 1409; *cl.* 26, 1621, 1626; *cl.* 58, Amendt. [196] 390; *cl.* 62, 421; Consid. Amendt. 773; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1954, 1955, 1958; [198] 39, 122, 581
Parliament—Business of the House, [198] 906, 908
Morning Sittings, [195] 1978
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1528
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1535, 1542
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1364
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 620;—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 805

Chelmsford, Lord
Bankruptcy, [194] 95; 2R. [197] 1416; Comm. [198] 17
Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 474; 3R. 825
Common Law Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [194] 1460
Dublin City Election, Address, [196] 1399
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [198] 673
Extradition Treaty with France, [198] 554
Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 1833
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1320, 1328, 1331, 1332; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1339
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1828; Comm. *cl.* 2, [197] 752; *cl.* 7, 756; *cl.* 9, 759; Commons' Amendts. [198] 323
Life Peerages, Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 1203
Marriage Law Commission Report, [195] 135
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Report, [196] 1286
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 1R. [195] 475
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 572

Chichester, Earl of
New Parishes, &c. 2R. [196] 1583

Child, Sir S., *Staffordshire, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1533; *cl.* 90, 1756

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Pontefract*
Abyssinian Expedition, [195] 30
Admiralty Accounts, [198] 1526
Australian Preserved Meat, [194] 487
Fisheries, Scotch and Irish, [198] 893
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [195] 1712; Comm. [197] 566
Herne Bay Oyster Grounds, [194] 408
India—Red Sea Route to, [198] 707
Malta—New Port and Docks, [195] 1695
Merchant Seamen and Greenwich Hospital, [196] 745
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1515
[*cont.*

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E.—*cont.*

- Navy—Questions, &c.
  - Admiralty Clerks, Pay of, [194] 206; [197] 412, 413
  - Admiralty, Constitution of the Board of, [194] 304
  - Admiralty Departments, Corruption in, [198] 1489
  - Africa—West Coast of, [198] 1528
  - Barnes, Mr. W., Case of, [195] 843
  - Channel and Mediterranean Fleets, [198] 797
  - Coal, Use of North Country, [195] 1354
  - Coastguard, [194] 629; [198] 454
  - Dockyard Distress, [195] 49
  - Dockyard Emigrants to Canada, [196] 1298
  - Dover Harbour, Moorings in, [195] 1583
  - Flying Squadron, [197] 311
  - Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 379
  - Greenwich Hospital, [194] 717
  - Greenwich Sixpence, [195] 1853
  - "Inconstant," The, [196] 263
  - Instructions to Officers on Foreign Stations, [194] 1353, 1354
  - Naval Chaplains, [194] 1654
  - Naval Contracts, [198] 647
  - Naval Reserve, Royal, [194] 484
  - Reserve Channel Squadron, [196] 1237
  - Water, Fresh, for the Fleet, [198] 892
  - "Will-of-the Wisp" Journal, [194] 208
- Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1623, 1625, 1626
- Navy—African Squadron, Motion for Returns, [195] 44
- Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 89, 90
  - Dockyards, &c. [195] 100
  - Half Pay, [195] 216
  - Marine Divisions, [195] 185, 186
  - Medical Establishments, [195] 185
  - Men and Boys, [194] 863, 896, 907, 929
  - Naval Stores, [195] 192, 193
  - New Works, [195] 212, 215, 217
  - Salaries, [195] 55, 66, 73, 76, 83
  - Steam Machinery, [195] 194, 199, 200, 202, 204, 209
  - Victualling Yards, &c. [195] 184
  - Victuals and Clothing, [194] 932
- Ryde Pier, [197] 358
- Supply—Grants in Aid, [198] 960
  - Greenwich Hospital, [196] 1577
- Venus, Transit of (1874), Comm. Res. [198] 1394, 1395

Children, &c. Protection Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 29 (No. 84)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 15, [197] 1864
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Airlie*); on Question, That ("now") &c.? resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this day three months

China

- *China, Relations with*, Question, Mr. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Otway *April* 29, [195] 1855
- *Hong Kong—Gambling Houses*, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 12, [197] 1667—*Legislative Council*, Question, Mr. Bowring; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 19, [198] 153
- *Hostility to Foreigners*, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Otway *April* 12, [195] 577
- *Insult to the French Chargé d'Affaires at Pekin*, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 28, [197] 625
- *Missionaries in China*, Question, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *Mar* 8, [194] 933
- *Missionaries and Gunboats in Formosa*, Question, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Earl of Clarendon; short debate thereon *April* 5, [195] 131
- *Rangoon and Western China—Overland Route*, Question, Colonel Gray; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 22, [195] 1356 (*Parl. P.* No. 420)
- *Tien-Tsin, Treaty of*, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of the Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce at Shanghai to Sir Rutherford Alcock, and his Reply to the Memorial addressed to Consul Medhurst, dated the 23rd day of March last:
  And, of all Correspondence of the Foreign Office, with Sir Rutherford Alcock on the subject of the renewal of the Treaty of Tien-tsin" (*Colonel Sykes*) *July* 13, [197] 1779; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Parl. Papers—

Relating to China . . .	[4097 1 to 11]
Reports of Journeys . .	[4187]

Church of England

- *Bahamas—Ecclesiastical Grants*, Question, Mr. Miall; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 12, [195] 581 Copy of Act—(*Parl. P.* No. 407)
- *Bishops of Protestant Churches—Ecclesiastical Titles Act*, Question, Lord Colchester; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 7, [196] 1280; Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 5, [197] 1169
  (See *Irish Church*)
- *Church Rates—Private Acts*, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 29, [195] 1854
- *Consecration Fees*, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Feb* 25, [194] 309
- *Disability of Episcopal Clergy to sit in Parliament*, Question, Lord Henry Thynne; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 23, [195] 1466
- *Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Deanery of Lichfield and Rectory of Tatenhill*, Question, Mr. M. A. Bass; Answer, Mr. Acland *Mar* 8, [194] 833—*Estates of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield*, Question, Lord George Cavendish; Answer, Mr. Acland *April* 13, [195] 676
- *Natal—Case of the Rev. Mr. Green*, Question, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 10, [196] 467

cont.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—*cont.*
Retirement of Bishops, Question, Sir Massey Lopes; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 12, [195] 581—*Bishops of Winchester, Salisbury, Exeter, and Bath and Wells*, Question, The Duke of Somerset; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury; short debate thereon *May* 3, [196] 4
Ritualistic Processions—St. George's-in-the-East, Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 8, [195] 355
St. James and St. Paul's, Lancashire, Question, Mr. R. Shaw; Answer, Mr. Acland *April* 12, [195] 576
Visitation Fees, Question, Colonel Brise; Answer, Mr. Stansfeld *April* 20, [195] 1196
Ecclesiastical Fees—(*Parl. P.* No. 149)
West Indies, Clergy in the, Question, Sir Charles Adderley; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 15, [197] 1889

Cinque Ports Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 9 [Bill 206]
Read 2°* *July* 12
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3°* *July* 22
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Morley*) *July* 23 (No. 216)
Read 2ª* *July* 27
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 53]

Civil and Diplomatic Appointments
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, all appointments to the Civil and Diplomatic Services ought to be obtained by open competition" (*Mr. Fawcett*), [195] 480; after short debate, Question put, "That the words &c.;" A. 281, N. 30; M. 251
Civil Service Appointments, Observations, Mr. Buxton; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *April* 2, [195] 31

Civil Offices (Pensions) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Resolution in Committee *Feb* 22, [194] 165
Resolution reported; Bill ordered* *Feb* 23
Read 1°* *Mar* 9 [Bill 42]
Read 2°* *Mar* 22
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 27, [196] 858
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, the further consideration of this Bill ought to be deferred until an inquiry has been made into the duties attached to some Political Offices which are now regarded as comparatively sinecure, and which offices for the first time will be entitled to Pensions under this Bill" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to; Committee; Report, 868 [Bill 133]
[*cont.*

Civil Offices (Pensions) Bill—cont.
Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 1, 1097
Considered, after debate *June* 24, [197] 536
Read 3°* *June* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *June* 29
Read 2ª* *July* 30 (No. 157)
Committee*; Report *August* 2
Read 3ª* *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 60]

Civil Service Pensions Bill
(*Mr. Locke King, Mr. Russell Gurney*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 11 [Bill 46]
Read 2°* *Mar* 18
Committee*; Report *April* 8
Read 3°* *April* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *April* 13
Read 2ª* *April* 30 (No. 53)
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" *May* 4, [196] 81; after short debate, House in Committee; Report
Read 3ª* *May* 13
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 15]

CLANCARTY, Earl of
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1885; Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [197] 874, 878; *cl.* 28, 1025; *cl.* 41, 1159; *cl.* 46, 1165; Report, 1486, 1492; 3R. Amendt. 1595, 1614

CLANRICARDE, Marquess of
Common Law Courts (Ireland), 2R. [194] 481; 3R. Amendt. [195] 339, 340
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Bills relating to, [194] 198
Fenian Prisoners, Released, [195] 671
Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 380
Mayor of Cork—Assassinations, [195] 1952
Murders in, [194] 1618, 1652
Police, [198] 665
State of, [195] 1967
Ireland—Crime, Address for Returns, [194] 946
Ireland—Sales of Tithe Rent Charge, &c., Motion for Returns, [195] 450
Irish Church, Comm. Preamble, [197] 742; *cl.* 2, 744; *cl.* 26, 999; *cl.* 27, 1021; *cl.* 28, 1025; *cl.* 33, 1156; *cl.* 45, 1164; *cl.* 68, 1236, 1249; Report, Amendt. 1504, 1507; Commons Amendts. [198] 279
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 1R. [195] 476
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 571
Spain—Case of the "Tornado," [195] 353, 354
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1157, 1194; Comm. 1573; [198] 776

CLARENDON, Earl of (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 471; Comm. 620, 622; 3R. 827
China—Missionaries in, [194] 937; [195] 132
Extradition Treaty with France, [198] 558
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1680; [197] 27, 28; Commons Amendts. [198] 258
Spain—Case of the "Tornado," [195] 353, 354
Turco-Persian Boundary, [196] 3
United States—"Alabama" Claims, [196] 1230

Clay, Mr. J., *Kingston-on-Hull*
Regina *v.* Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 994
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1582

Clergy Discipline and Ecclesiastical Courts Bill [H.L.]—*See* **Ecclesiastical Courts Bill**
(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 5 (No. 26)
Bill read 2ª, and referred to the Select Committee on Ecclesiastical Courts Bill *April* 15

Clerk of Assize Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 8 [Bill 203]
Read 2°* *July* 19
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3°* *July* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 2 (No. 248)
Read 2ª* *August* 3
Committee*; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 89]

Cleveland, Duke of
Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 9
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1742
Education, Public, [194] 824
Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 711; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1324; *cl.* 17, 1346; *cl.* 12, [195] 229
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 60; Comm. *cl.* 27, 1000; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1026; *cl.* 68, 1239; Report, 1512; Commons Amendts. [198] 426
Life Peerages, Comm. [196] 1189
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 12
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 405
Scotland—Hypothec, Law of, [194] 1652
Wiltes Peerage, Report, Amendt. [196] 426

Clifton, Sir R. J., *Nottingham*
Beerhouses, &c., 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [195] 1781

Clive, Mr. G., *Hereford City*
Turnpike Trusts, [194] 483

Coal Fields of the United Kingdom
Motion for an Address "respecting the Report of the Royal Commission on the Exhaustion of the Coal Fields appointed in July 1866" (*Mr. Pease*) *June* 15, [196] 1910; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Coal Mines
Accidents in — Legislation, Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Feb* 25, [194] 312; Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 8, [195] 359; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 15, 844; Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 26, [198] 685
Motion for Address for "a Copy of the Memorial presented to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, praying for a special inquiry into the recent Accidents in Coal Mines" (*Lord Elcho*) *August* 9, [198] 1517; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Reports of Inspectors, Question, Mr. Dimsdale; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 11, [194] 1089

Cogan, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare Co.*
Metropolis—St. Marylebone Workhouse School, [197] 944
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 509

Colchester, Lord
Bishops of Protestant Churches, [196] 1280
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1330
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 96; Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. 884, 885; Report, Amendt. 1493
Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 473

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, S.*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 862
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 158
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [198] 1363; *cl.* 2, 1365, Amendt. 1366
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 384
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 821; *cl.* 2, 828; *cl.* 4, 1113; *cl.* 6, 1115; *cl.* 11, 1120; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1121; *cl.* 24, 1232; *cl.* 44, 1393; Consid. *cl.* 5, 1452, 1457, 1465
Scotland—Education, [194] 1904
Scotland—Endowed Schools, &c., Motion for a Commission, [196] 1439, 1445
Scotland—Faggot Voting in Scotch Counties, [194] 1185; Motion for a Return, 1269
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 514, 515, 521

Coleridge, Sir J. D., *see* Solicitor General, The

Collier, Sir R. P., *see* Attorney General, The

Collins, Mr. T., *Boston*
Army Estimates—Militia, &c. [196] 1574
Army—Militia and Reserve Forces, Motion for Returns, [195] 1761
Army—Militia—Snider Rifle, [194] 2002
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 397; *add. cl.* 535; Consid. 1086
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 54, [196] 1597; *cl.* 59, 1605
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [198] 1126
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1817
County Courts, 2R. [196] 686
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 951
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. Instruction, [198] 226, 230, 232
Endowed Schools, Motion for a Committee, [195] 23, 24, 125
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1746; *cl.* 29, 1772; *cl.* 41, 1780, 1781
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 1784

[*cont.*

COLLINS, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1366
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [198] 1279; *cl.* 11, 1280
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 398
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 574
Imprisonment for Debt—Case of John Kenn, [194] 768
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, Amendt. [195] 1274
Ireland—Irish Clergy, Future Status of the, [195] 1198
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 46; *cl.* 39, 297; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1987
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. Amendt. [196] 1448; Instruction, [197] 467; [198] 360; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 365
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1133
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 670
Dublin City Writ, [196] 1792
New Writs, [194] 19
Youghal Election—New Writ, Amendt. [195] 2068
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1240, 1383; *cl.* 59, 1443; *cl.* 66, 1447
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 818
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 977; [197] 1887
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 465
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 799
Supply—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 973
Telegraphs, Consid. [198] 977
Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 233
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 789

Colonial Offenders Removal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Granville*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 9 (No. 46)
Bill withdrawn* *April* 13

Colonial Prisoners Removal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Granville*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 13 (No. 55)
Read 2ª* *April* 16
Committee*; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª* *April* 20
c. Read 1º* *April* 22 [Bill 92]
Read 2º* *April* 26
Committee*; Report *April* 27
Read 3º* *April* 28
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 10]

Colonial Returns since 1859
Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 10, [196] 470
Parl. Papers—
West Indies—Jamaica . . . [4090]
Statistical Abstract, 1853 to 1867 . . . . [4194]

COLONSAY, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 888
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 14, [194] 1341
North British Railway—Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 570
[*cont.*

COLONSAY, Lord—*cont.*
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [196] 442; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 459; *cl.* 37, 461; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 466; Report, 1283; Amendt. 1284, 1286; *cl.* 28, 1290; Commons Amendts. [198] 1480

Commissioners of Taxes, Clerks to Local—Compensation
Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, [196] 1207

Common Law Courts (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Granville*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 23 (No. 9)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Lord Dufferin*) *Mar* 2, [194] 481; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *Mar* 16, 1459
Report* *April* 5
Read 3ª *April* 8, [195] 339
c. Read 1º* *April* 12 [Bill 74]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 21

Commons, Inclosure of, on Crown Manors
Question, Mr. Walsh; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 16, [195] 976

Companies Clauses Act (1863) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Eykyn*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *May* 28 [Bill 138]
Read 2º* *June* 9
Committee*; Report *June* 22
Read 3º* *June* 23
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 24
Read 2ª* *July* 5 (No. 147)
Committee* *July* 15
Report* *July* 19
Read 3ª* *July* 22
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 48]

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Craufurd*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *August* 9 [Bill 266]

CONOLLY, Mr. T., *Donegal Co.*
Ireland—State of, [195] 2033
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1379, 1382, 1384; *cl.* 25, 1596, 1601, 1602, 1611, 1613, 1615; *cl.* 26, 1625, 1627, 1628, 1629; *cl.* 29, 1895, 1929; *cl.* 32, [196] 37, 47; *cl.* 39, 134, 135, 148; Lords' Amendts. [197] 1985; [198] 42
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 234

Consolidated Fund (£8,406,272 13s. 4d.) Bill
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 10
Read 2º* *Mar* 11
Committee*; Report *Mar* 12
Read 3º* *Mar* 15
l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 15
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Mar* 16
Read 3ª* *Mar* 18
Royal Assent *Mar* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 1]

Consolidated Fund (£17,100,000) Bill
c. Ordered * *April* 22
Read 1° * *April* 23
Read 2°, after short debate *April* 26, [195] 1647
Committee *; Report *April* 27
Read 3° * *April* 28
l. Read 1ª * *April* 29
Read 2ª * *April* 30
Committee *; Report *May* 3
Read 3ª * *May* 4
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 8]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 31
Read 2° * *August* 2
Committee; Report *August* 3, [198] 1146
Read 3° *August* 4, 1282
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Granville*) *August* 5
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 93]

Constabulary Returns
Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 29, [195] 1850

Contagious Diseases Act (1866)
Question, Viscount Lifford; Answer, The Earl of Morley *Feb* 25, [194] 284; Question, Mr. Mitford; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 25, 303
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the working of the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866, and to consider whether, and how far, and under what conditions, it may be expedient to extend its operation" (*Mr. Secretary Bruce*) *May* 13, [196] 808; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *June* 8, Committee nominated as follows:— Captain Vivian (Chairman), Dr. Brewer, Lord Charles Bruce, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Childers, Mr. Collins, Mr. Donald Dalrymple, Sir James Elphinstone, Captain Grosvenor, Marquess of Hamilton, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Mills, Mr. Mitford, Mr. Murphy, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Rathbone, Sir John Simeon, Mr. Tipping, Sir John Trelawny, and Mr. Percy Wyndham
Report of Select Committee *July* 8 (*Parl. P.* No. 306)

Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 8 (No. 29)
Bill withdrawn * *May* 7

Contagious Diseases (*Animals*) *Bill*
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *June* 10, [196] 1498
Returns—(*Parl. P.* No. 247)
Conveyance of Cattle, Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *August* 9, [198] 1491
Slaughter of Cattle, Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *August* 9, [198] 1492

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Considered in Committee; after short debate, a Resolution agreed to *Feb* 17, [194] 90; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 10, 996
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Headlam*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 197, N. 253; M. 56; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
194] c. Acts read; considered in Committee; after short debate, a Resolution agreed to *Mar* 4, 672; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 38]
. Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 16, 1466
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 8, [195] 434; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *May* 3 [Bill 103]
Re-comm *—R.P. *June* 14
Committee *—R.P. *July* 2
197] Committee—R.P. *July* 6, 12
. Committee—R.P. *July* 9, 1528
. Committee; Report *July* 13, 1755 [Bill 212]
Considered * *July* 20 [Bill 226]
198] Read 3° *July* 22, 520
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 23
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 29, 886; after debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 217)
. Committee *July* 30, 989
Report * *August* 2 (No. 240)
. Bill read 3ª, and passed *August* 3, 1137 (No. 261)
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 70]

Contagious Diseases Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Northbrook*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 23 (No. 221)
Read 2ª * *July* 27
Committee * *July* 29
Report * *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 2
c. Read 1° * *August* 2 [Bill 255]
Read 2° * *August* 5
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Considered * *August* 7
Read 3° * *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 96]

Contagious Diseases Prevention (Metropolis) Bill (*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 8 (No. 176)
Order for 2R. discharged *July* 22

Copyhold, Inclosure, and Charity Commission—Expenses of
Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 5, [195] 141

Copyright (Periodicals) Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 22 [Bill 93]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 10

CORBETT, Colonel E., *Shropshire, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1531
Diplomatic Salaries, &c. Comm. *cl.* 7, [196] 1339
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1327
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 667
Real Property, Res. [196] 600

Corn and Grain Measurement Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Goldney*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 23 [Bill 177]

Coronation Oath
Question, Observations, Lord Redesdale; Reply, Earl Granville *April* 19, [195] 1059; Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 29, [198] 893; Question, Observations, Mr. Charley; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 29, 906

Corporation of London Bill
(*Mr. Buxton, Mr. Thomas Hughes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 8 [Bill 40]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 16

CORRANCE, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, E.*
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 505
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1304; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 391, 393; *cl.* 4, 526
Cattle Plague—Importation of Diseased Sheep, [195] 1696
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 437; Comm. *cl.* 27, [197] 1293; *cl.* 64, 1535
Ireland—Church Property, [194] 1087
*Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 257
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 86
Business of the House, [195] 1471, 1472
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 471, 495, 538
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 586;—(Customs and Excise Duties), Res. 2, Amendt. [196] 795, 796, 799

Corrupt Practices Commissions
Question, Lord Henry Thynne; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 30, [195] 1975
(*See the several Boroughs*)

CORRY, Right Hon. H. T. L., *Tyrone Co.*
Navy—African Squadron, Motion for Returns, [195] 46
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [195] 86, 99
Dockyards, &c. [195] 100, 101, 102; Amendt. 106
Half Pay, [195] 216
Marine Divisions, [195] 186
Medical Establishments, [195] 185
Men and Boys, [194] 878, 888, 890, 900, 907, 931
Naval Stores, [195] 188
Salaries, [195] 52, 76
Steam Machinery, [195] 194, 200, 203, 210
Victuals and Clothing, [194] 932

County Coroners Bill
(*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Thomas Chambers, Mr. Pease*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Goldney*) *April* 13, [195] 752; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 75]
Read 2°* *May* 27
Committee*; Report *May* 28 [Bill 135]
Re-comm.*—R.P. *July* 14
Bill withdrawn* *July* 21

County Court Judges (*Salaries*)
Moved, "That, having regard to the Admiralty Act of last Session, by virtue of which an entirely new jurisdiction has been conferred upon certain County Courts, and to the Bankruptcy Bill, under which the district County Courts will take the place and perform the functions of the district Bankruptcy Courts, and with a view to secure efficiency in the office of County Court Judge, in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the judges upon whom the new duties and responsibilities may be imposed should receive an additional remuneration of £300 a year" (*Mr. Hibbert*) *June* 29, [197] 816; after debate, Question put; A. 56, N. 102; M. 46

County Courts Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19 [Bill 9]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 17, [194] 1561
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Francis Goldsmid*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn: 2R. deferred
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 12, [196] 684; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *May* 27

County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act (1868) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Candlish*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 12 [Bill 121]
Read 2°* *June* 22
Committee*; Report *June* 30
Read 3°* *July* 5
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Houghton*) *July* 6
Read 2ª* *July* 27 (No. 173)
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 51]

County Financial Arrangements
Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *May* 28, [196] 879

County Financial Boards Bill
Afterwards
County Administration Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Arthur Peel*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*) *May* 11, [196] 602; after debate, Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 119]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 19

Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster) Bill
(*Mr. West, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Davison*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 26 [Bill 26]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 5, [194] 774
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. West*) *April* 5, [195] 217
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Serjeant Simon*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to; Committee—R.P.
Committee *; Report *April* 19
Considered * *April* 22 [Bill 86]
Read 3° * *April* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Dufferin*) *April* 27
Read 2ª * *July* 1 (No. 79)
Committee * *July* 13 (No. 186)
Report * *July* 15
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 37]

Court of Exchequer (Ireland) Offices Bill
(*Colonel French, Mr. M'Mahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 63]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 4

Court of Probate (District Registrar Clerks)
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *June* 10, [196] 1495

Court of Session Act (1868) Amendment Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 145]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 28
Read 3° * *June* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Morley*) *July* 1 (No. 164)
Read 2ª * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 36]

COURTOWN, Earl of
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [197] 752; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 922; *cl.* 39, 1158; *cl.* 19, 1265; Commons' Amendts. [198] 443

Courts of Justice Site Bill—The New
Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 8, [195] 356; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [198] 1529
Carey Street Site, Questions, Mr. Monk; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Ayrton *August* 3, [198] 1143
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to re-consider the question of Carey Street as the site of the New Law Courts, inasmuch as the Thames Embankment, between the Temple and Somerset House, now offers many advantages for the erection of such buildings" (*Mr. W. H. Gregory*) *April* 20, [195] 1202

[*cont.*

Courts of Justice Site Bill—The New—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "desirable," and add "to proceed as soon as possible with the erection of the New Law Courts, and the offices connected therewith, upon the site appropriated for that purpose by the Act 28 and 29 Vic. c. 49; and that if additional land be necessary for the proper erection of such Courts and offices, such additional land ought to be acquired in immediate proximity to that site" (*Sir Roundell Palmer*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
Question, Mr. W. H. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 27, 1699; Questions, Mr. Pemberton, Lord Henry Lennox; Answers, Mr. Layard *May* 3, [196] 14; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 10, 1496
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the site and charge of the New Courts of Law" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *June* 22, [197] 458; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *June* 28, Committee nominated as follows: — Lord Stanley (Chairman), Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Cowper, Viscount Enfield, Mr. Goldney, Mr. W. H. Gregory, Earl Grosvenor, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Hope, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Layard, Lord John Manners, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Tite, Mr. Torrens, and Mr. Watkin Williams
Report of Select Committee *July* 30 (*Parl. P.* No. 381)
Report of Select Committee, Observations, Lord Denman *August* 10, [198] 1523
Designs, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 3, [196] 1209

Parl. Papers—

Mr. Shield's Report	68
Monies advanced	195, 238
Report on Site	273
Report of Committee on Plans .	274
Correspondence	317

Courts of Justice (New Site) Bill
(*Mr. Layard, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Layard*) *May* 10, [196] 538; after long debate, Bill ordered; read 1° * and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills [Bill 113]

Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Resolutions in Committee *April* 22
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 23 [Bill 96]
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Considered * *July* 15 [Bill 218]
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *July* 23 (No. 215)
Read 2ª * *August* 2
Committee *; Report *August* 3
Read 3ª * *August* 5
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 91]

Coventry Election
Moved, "That the Petition of Charles Flint and others [presented 10th June], relating to the Coventry Election Petition Inquiry, be printed with the Votes" (*Mr. Bouverie*) *July* 1, [197] 295; after debate, Question put, and negatived
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the allegations of the Petition of Charles Flint and others [presented 10th June], respecting the late inquiry into the Election of Members for the City of Coventry, and to report their opinion as to what proceedings, if any, should be taken thereon" (*Mr. Bouverie*) *July* 6, [197] 1330; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Cowper, Earl
Ireland—State of, [196] 732
United States—Hog Cholera, [195] 942

Cowper, Right Hon. W. F., *Hampshire, S.*
Army—Military Train, [195] 1200
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1240
Inclosure Act, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [195] 1287
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [194] 485
Thames Embankment, [194] 143
Victoria Park, [196] 749
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 267
Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1471
Probate Court and Registries, Amendt. [197] 1210
Public Offices Site, [197] 1206, 1209
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 656, 661

Cowper, Hon. H. F., *Hertfordshire*
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 52

Cox, Mr. Serjeant E. W., *Taunton*
Trades Unions, [194] 366

Craufurd, Mr. E. H. J., *Ayr, &c.*
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), Comm. [195] 220
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1718, 2066; Nomination of Committee, [196] 1783
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 373
Libel, 2R. [195] 758
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1220
Park Lane and Piccadilly Thoroughfare, Motion for Papers, [195] 757
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1731; Comm. [198] 807; *cl.* 1, 821; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 831, 834; 1110; *cl.* 4, 1112; *cl.* 6, 1115, 1116; *cl.* 9, 1118; *cl.* 14, 1122; *cl.* 19, 1124; *cl.* 24, 1242, 1243; *cl.* 59, 1443; *cl.* 65, 1446; *cl.* 66, 1446, 1449; Consid. Amendt. 1456, 1464
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1591
Revising Barristers, Appointment of, [198] 1535, 1536
Scotland—Assessments, [194] 1188
Sheriff Courts, [196] 1635
[*cont.*

Craufurd, Mr. E. H. J.—*cont.*
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1253
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 513, 515, 533
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, Motion for reporting Progress, [198] 510, 512
Report, Amendt. [198] 690
Stationery Office, [197] 1700
Works, &c. Amendt. [197] 1709
Ways and Means, Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 614

Crawford, Mr. R. W., *London*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 792
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [198] 1146
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 819, 823, 836; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 842; *cl.* 8, 844; *cl.* 18, 847
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1392
Endowed Schools, Motion for a Committee, [195] 23
House Tax, Res. [197] 1805
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1174
Telegraphic Communication, [198] 1490
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 723
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 336, 1057
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [197] 1187
Public Business, [197] 1669
Post Office—Mails to the United States, [194] 1464
Stamp Acts, Consolidation of the, [195] 30, 123
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [197] 673
Telegraph, [197] 1224; Comm. [198] 758
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 416; Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), 592, 596, 606, 611, 636

Creditors Sequestrations Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Harrowby*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *August* 5 (No. 275)

Crichton, Viscount, *Enniskillen*
Ireland—Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, [195] 503
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1843; Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1880
Party Processions (Ireland), [197] 1589

Crimea—British Graves in the
Question, Mr. Stopford; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 3, [196] 17; *May* 13, 747

Criminal Law
Betting Houses—Suppression of, Question, Mr. H. F. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 6, [196] 261; Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 24, [197] 514
Brentford Magistrates—Sentence on Children, Question, Mr. Bowring; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 31, [196] 970
Burglaries at Staines, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 11, [198] 1542
Capital Punishment, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 30, [198] 995
[*cont.*

CRIMINAL LAW—*cont.*
Case of George Roberts, a Convict, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 22, [194] 161
Case of James Bell, Convicted of Sheep-stealing, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 5, [198] 1294
Case of Richard Bonner, a Convict, Question, Mr. Walter; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 22, [194] 162
Conviction of Felony, Law of Forfeiture on, Question, Mr. C. Forster; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 9, [197] 1542
Conviction of Three Children at Salisbury, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 13, [195] 675; Observations, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *June* 11, [196] 1608
Costs of Prosecutions, Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 27, [196] 811
Gibraltar Convict Prison, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 9, [194] 952
Habitual Criminals Bill, Notice, The Earl of Kimberley *Feb* 23, [194] 199 [See *Bill*]
Habitual Criminals — Repression of Crime, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 19, [194] 147
Inequality of Sentences, Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 6, [198] 1373; *August* 10, 1530
Infanticide, Question, Mr. Raikes; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 3, [198] 1143
Liberation of Sir Eardley Culling Eardley, Question, Mr. Scourfield; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 20, [195] 1200
Reformatory Schools—Juvenile Offenders in, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 13, [196] 742
Remission of Capital Sentences — Case of Charles Wiltshire, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 22, [195] 1358; Explanation, Mr. Bruce *April* 27, 1700
Salisbury Gaol—Removal of Prisoners, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Feb* 25, [194] 312
Special and Common Juries, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 26, [194] 352
Still-Born Children, Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 14, [197] 1819
See titles *Prisons* (*Religious Instruction*)
Prisoners—(*Political Offenders*)

Criminal Lunatics Bill (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 172]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *August* 2 (No. 247)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 78]

CROFT, Sir H. G. D., *Herefordshire*
Bridges, Repair of, [197] 1886
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 568
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1814
Ireland—Bankruptcy Law, [194] 1355
Salmon Fishery Laws, [195] 975
Sea Fishing Boats, [195] 1464

CROSS, Mr. R. Assheton, *Lancashire, S.W.*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 791, 1186; Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1407; *cl.* 59, 1603
County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 613
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 774; Comm. [195] 220
Fire Insurances, Res. [195] 307
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 337
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 762
194] Irish Church, 2R. 1735
195] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1028; *cl.* 12, 1110, 1113; *cl.* 14, 1149, 1151, 1379; *cl.* 16, 1410; *cl.* 22, 1517; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1600, 1602
197] Lords Amendts. 1919, 1942
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Leave, [194] 331; Instruction, [197] 470
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee; Motion for Adjournment, [194] 1307
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 817, 818
Salisbury Magistrates, The, [196] 1619
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 423;—Res. 2 (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 784, 792

CROSSLEY, Sir F., *Yorkshire, W. R., N. Div.*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 790
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1517
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1297
Ways and Means—Res. (Corn, &c.), [195] 636

CUBITT, Mr. G., *Surrey, W.*
County Coroners, Leave, [195] 753
United States—Speer, Captain, Murder of, [196] 1498

Cumberland and Westmoreland—Lord Lieutenant of
Motion for an humble Address "praying Her Majesty to revoke the appointment of Henry Lowther, Esq., to be Lord Lieutenant of the Counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland" (*Mr. Charles Howard*) *April* 13, [195] 728; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Commissions since 1760—(*P.P.* No. 101)

Currency
Currency Laws, Observations, Mr. Delahunty Reply, Mr. Ayrton *July* 30, [198] 1053

[*cont.*

Currency—cont.
Gold Coinage, Observations, Mr. J. B. Smith; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *August* 6, [198] 1408; Question, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, 1532
Melting of English Sovereigns, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [198] 1527
Coinage 1859 to 1868—(*Parl. P.* No. 157)

Cursitor (*County Palatine of Durham*) *Bill*
See *Inclosure Awards* (*County Palatine of Durham Bill*

Custom House—Clearing Vessels
Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 13, [197] 1754

Customs and Inland Revenue Duties Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Presented; read 1° * *April* 23 [Bill 95]
196] Read 2°, after debate *May* 11, 585
Committee *May* 27, 812; after debate, Report Considered * *May* 31 [Bill 132]
Read 3° * *June* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *June* 3 (No. 111)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 11, 1585; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 14]

Customs, Clerks in the
Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *August* 10, [198] 1525
"*Writers*" *in the—Annual Leave*, Question, Captain Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *June* 28, [197] 624

Dagenham Dock Company
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, [198] 1371

DALGLISH, Mr. R., *Glasgow*
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 361
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1734; Comm. [198] 814
Portugal—Claims on the Government, [196] 1243
Ways and Means—Res. 2 (Customs and Excise Duties, [196] 807

DALHOUSIE, Earl of
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1457
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 287; Comm. Preamble, 724
North British Railway — Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 568, 569
Parochial Schools (Scotland), [195] 568; Comm. [196] 442; *cl.* 21, 460; *cl.* 37, 461
Scotland—Police Systems, [196] 706

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 398
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2035; Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 140; Lords Amendts. [198] 86
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1736; Comm. *cl.* 3, [198] 837
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1267

DALRYMPLE, Mr. D., *Bath*
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1308
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1533
Fire Insurances, Res. [195] 307
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1815
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 426
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1367
Norwich Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 12
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [198] 1391; Consid. *add. cl.* 1452, 1462
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 680
Regina *v.* Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 977
Supply—Learned Societies, [198] 504
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 3, [198] 765

DALWAY, Mr. M. R., *Carrickfergus*
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 664

DAMER, Hon. Captain L. DAWSON-, *Portarlington*
Blatcher, William, Case of, [194] 1655
Fever Patients, Conveyance of, [194] 411, 626
Metropolis — Semaphore near Palace Yard, [194] 1088, 1655
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1792

D'ARCY, Mr. M. P., *Wexford Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1115

DAVENPORT, Mr. W. BROMLEY-, *Warwickshire, N.*
District Medical Officers, Birmingham, [194] 1089
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1647

DAVISON, Mr. J. R., *Durham* (*City*)
Assessed Taxes, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 382

DAWSON, Mr. R. PEEL-, *Londonderry Co.*
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1792
Ireland—Cork, Mayor of, [196] 13, 102
Grand Jury Laws, [194] 156
Seditious Language in the Queen's Colleges, [197] 517
Ireland — Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 713
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1629; *cl.* 36, [196] 67, 68
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 489
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [194] 993

Debts of Deceased Persons Bill
(*Mr. Hinde Palmer, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Headlam*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 16 [Bill 165]
Read 2°* *June* 22
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Considered* *June* 30
Read 3°* *July* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Romilly*) *July* 2 (No. 169)
Read 2ª* *July* 23
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª* *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 46]

De Grey and Ripon, Earl (Lord President of the Council)
Aggravated Assaults Amendment, 2R. [196] 565
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 886, 889; Comm. *cl.* 2, 988; *cl.* 64, 990; 3R. 1137
Education of Children, 2R. Amendt. [197] 1738
Education, Public, [194] 811
197] Endowed Schools, 2R. 607, 623; Comm. 1872, 1873; *cl.* 8, 1875; *cl.* 12, 1876; *cl.* 14, 1877; *cl.* 15, 1880, 1881, 1882; *cl.* 20, 1883; *cl.* 30, 1884; *cl.* 42, 1885
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1878; Comm. *cl.* 12, [197] 872; *cl.* 13, 878; *cl.* 26, 1000; Report, 1492; 3R. 1619, 1620
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1784; Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 445; *cl.* 19, 448; *cl.* 20, 458; *cl.* 68, 464
United States—Hog Cholera, [195] 942

De Grey, Hon. T., *Norfolk, W.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1416
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 255

Delahunty, Mr. J., *Waterford City*
Currency Laws (Ireland), [198] 1053
Irish Church, Lords Amendts. [198] 85
Money Laws (Ireland), Leave, [194] 273; 2R. [197] 471, 485

De la Warr, Earl
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1456
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 30, [197] 1883

De L'Isle and Dudley, Lord
National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 651

Denbigh, Earl of
Irish Church, Comm. [197] 686; *cl.* 28, 1076; Report, 1513; 3R. 1657
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1767; Comm. *cl.* 20, [196] 458

Denison, Right Hon. J. E. (*see* Speaker, The)

Denison, Mr. C. Beckett-, *Yorkshire, W. R., E. Div.*
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [198] 1363
India—Affghanistan, Ameer of, [194] 955
Punjaub Tenancy Act, [196] 1591; [198] 1145
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1351
Liabilities of Railway Companies, [198] 1434
Metropolis—Park Lane Improvements, [195] 1973
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 3R. [198] 1343

Denison, Mr. E., *Newark*
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 501

Denman, Lord
Assessed Rates, 2R. [197] 1751
Bankruptcy, Comm. [198] 681
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [198] 676; Comm. *cl.* 1, 987
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1331; *cl.* 12, 1337
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [197] 746; *cl.* 13, 882, 886; 3R. 1619
Life Peerages, 2R. Amendt. [195] 1676; 3R. [197] 1396, 1400
New Courts of Justice, Report of Select Committee, [198] 1523
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Reprint, [198] 1524
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1691

Denman, Hon. G., *Tiverton*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 1212; *cl.* 6, 1215; *cl.* 91, 1899; *cl.* 130, [197] 326, 328
County Courts, 2R. [196] 685
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1230, 1236
Coventry Election, Motion for a Committee, [197] 1334
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1182
Evidence Amendment, Leave, [194] 406; 2R. [195] 1798
Parliament — Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2072
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 922
South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 648
University Tests, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1102

Dent, Mr. J. D., *Scarborough*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [197] 533
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Leave, [194] 93; 2R. 1037
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 680; Comm. *cl.* 67, [197] 1539; *cl.* 73, 1541; *cl.* 101, 1764
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 847
Parliament—Whitsuntide Recess, [196] 585
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [196] 1147
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1545
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 645
House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476

Derby, Earl of
Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [196] 1584
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 16
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1328
Ireland—State of, [196] 718, 720, 724, 726
Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1090
197] Irish Church, 2R. 18, 27, 28, 36, 37, 48 ; . Comm. *cl.* 13, 878 ; *cl.* 14, 891 ; *cl.* 18, 923, . 924 ; Report, 1521 ; 3R. 1614, 1620
198] Commons Amendts. 293, 312, 313
Life Peerages, 2R. [195] 1648, 1665
Oriel College, Oxford, 2R. [194] 800
Parliament—Despatch of Business, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1309
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 599, 800

De Ros, Lord
Ireland—Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1092
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [197] 1125
Militia, 3R. [196] 99

Derry, Bishop of
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1728 ; Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 891, 912 ; *cl.* 29, 1131

De Vesci, Viscount
Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 443

Devon, Earl of
Irish Church, [196] 1279 ; 3R. Amendt. [197] 1614
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [198] 1076 ; Comm. 1284

Devonshire, Duke of
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 76

Dick, Mr. W. W. Fitzwilliam, *Wicklow Co.*
Ireland—Bankruptcy Law, [194] 1355
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, Motion for reporting Progress, [195] 1415

Dickinson, Mr. S. S., *Stroud*
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1303 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1316, 1319, 1320 ; *cl.* 2, 1322 ; *cl.* 3, 1322, 1323
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1364, 1365 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1367
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 9, [198] 1279
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1361
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1828

Dickson, Major A. G., *Dover*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1173
Army—Wightman, Ensign, Case of, [196] 388
Navy — Dover Harbour, Moorings in, [195] 1583

Digby, Mr. K. T., *Queen's Co.*
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 491

Dilke, Sir C. W., *Chelsea*
Assessed Rates, Consid. Amendt. [197] 1084
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1121
Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1328
China—Relations with, [195] 1855
China — Tien-tsin, Treaty of, Motion for Papers, [197] 1796
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 493
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1366
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1796
India—Seat of Government, Removal of, [194] 312
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1349
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 472
O'Farrell Papers, The, [195] 1755
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 981
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1373

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, [196] 1764
Hayti—Civil War in, [194] 837
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1730
Railways—Accident at Abergele, [196] 938
South Kensington Museum, Motion for a Paper, [196] 1635
Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [197] 1209
Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 544
Excesses on Grants, [194] 772
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 678
House of Commons Offices, [197] 1478
Houses of Parliament, [197] 684 ; Report, Amendt. 1429
Patent Office, [197] 1685, 1686
Post Office Packet Service, [194] 770, 771
Public Buildings, [197] 675
Public Offices Site, [197] 1204
Report, [194] 537
Royal Palaces, [197] 654
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 656
Treasury, &c. Departments, [197] 1478

Dimsdale, Mr. R., *Hertford*
Coal Mines—Reports of Inspectors, [194] 1089
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 12, [198] 1281

Diplomatic Pensions
Question, Mr. Staveley Hill ; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 11, [196] 1589

Diplomatic Service [Salaries and Allowances] Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Resolution in Committee *May* 10
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *May* 11 [Bill 118]
Read 2°* *May* 27
Committee *—r.p. *June* 3
Committee ; Report *June* 7, [196] 1336
Considered * *June* 10
Read 3°* *June* 11

[*cont.*

Diplomatic Service [Salaries and Allowances] Bill—cont.
l. Read 1^{a}* (*Earl of Clarendon*) *June* 14 (No. 128)
Read 2^{a}* *June* 25
Committee * *July* 13
Report * *July* 15
Read 3^{a}* *July* 16
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 43]

"Diseases, Nomenclature of"—Distribution of
Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 19, [194] 1789

DISRAELI, Right Hon. B., *Buckinghamshire*
Civil Service Appointments, [195] 36
Ireland—State of, [195] 2007
194] Irish Church, Leave, 466, 469 ; 2R. Amendt. 1662, 1680
195] 356, 585 ; Comm. 934 ; *cl.* 2, 993, 1052 ; *cl.* 15, 1401 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1488, 1494 ; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1518, 1531 ; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1585, 1592 ; *cl.* 26, 1629 ; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1629, 1647 ; *cl.* 29, 1886 ; Amendt. 1887, 1922, 1927
196] *cl.* 32, Amendt. 44 ; *cl.* 33, 62, 66 ; *cl.* 39, 292 ; 3R. 1042
197] Lords Amendts. 1892, 1910, 1954, 1987, 1993
198] 23, 51, 57, 98, 100, 583
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 731
National Portrait Gallery—Hogarth's Portrait, [198] 996
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 208, 212
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 67 ; Report, 108
Business of the House, [194] 1092
Supply—Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 539, 544
National Gallery, [198] 501
University Tests, [198] 452
Ways and Means, Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), [195] 600

Dividends on Public Stocks Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered ; read 1^{o}* *July* 29 [Bill 247]
Read 2^{o}* *July* 30
Committee * ; Report *August* 2
Considered * *August* 3
Read 3^{o}* *August* 4
l. Read 1^{a}* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 5 (No. 269)
Read 2^{a}* *August* 6
Committee * ; Report *August* 7
Read 3^{a}* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 104]

DIXON, Mr. G., *Birmingham*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 392, 397 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 534 ; Consid. 1086
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 315
Birmingham Board of Guardians, [194] 1901
Clergy, The, and Parliament, [196] 746
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1207
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 31, Amendt. [196] 1779
[*cont.*

DIXON, Mr. G.—*cont.*
India—Rifles for, [194] 1653
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 610
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 666
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1374
Poor Law, Res. [197] 438
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 187

DODDS, Mr. J., *Stockton*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [197] 1768
Fisheries, English, [194] 90
Ireland—Fisheries Commission, [195] 358
Pollution of Rivers, [198] 453
Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [197] 1457

DODSON, Mr. J. G. (Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means), *Sussex, E.*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 369, 391
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 443 ; Comm. *cl.* 96, [197] 1761, 1762
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1796
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 423 ; *cl.* 14, 580
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, [195] 1594, 1595, 1596 ; *cl.* 27, 1643 ; *cl.* 29, 1929 ; *cl.* 32, [196] 23 ; *cl.* 37, 74 ; *cl.* 39, 147, 267, 308, 318
Parliament—New Standing Orders, [198] 1485
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 292
Parliament—Private Business—Railway Bills, Res. [194] 105, 106
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 646
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 512
Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 950
Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1704
Royal Parks, [197] 656
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 788, 789

DOWNING, Mr. McCarthy, *Cork Co.*
Ireland—Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, [195] 497 ; [197] 1343
Landlord and Tenant, Law of, [194] 353
State of, [195] 2057
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, [195] 1606 ; *cl.* 33, [196] 54 ;* *cl.* 39, 311
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 498
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 619, 620, 621
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 232 ; 2R. 584
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1558 ; [197] 1588
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 329
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 811
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 802
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 740

DOWSE, Mr. Serjeant R., *Londonderry Bo.*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 13, [196] 1220 ; *cl.* 14, 1224
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1534
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1811
[*cont.*

Dowse, Mr. Serjeant R.—*cont.*
Ireland—Londonderry, Riots in, [196] 20
State of, [195] 2030, 2032
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 695, 708
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1955; Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1483, 1487; *cl.* 25, 1611; *cl.* 26, 1626; *cl.* 33, Amendt. [196] 55, 65; *cl.* 36, 70, 71; *cl.* 58, 394, 412; Lords Amendts. [198] 32, 951
Libel, 2R. [194] 1613
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 366
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1556
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1477
Statute Law, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1253
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 508
Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1462
Stationery Office, [197] 1698
Turkey—Christians in Crete, [198] 19

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act (1863) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 208]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 2 (No. 256)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 72]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 55]
Read 2° * *Mar* 22
Committee *; Report *Mar* 23
Read 3° * *April* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Dufferin*) *April* 5 (No. 39)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. lx.]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands Ireland (Supplemental) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Glyn*)
c. Ordered * *June* 7
Read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 151]
Read 2° * *June* 14
Committee *; Report *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *June* 18 (No. 136)
Read 2ª * *July* 30
Committee *; Report *August* 2
Read 3ª * *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. cxlix.]

Drogheda Writ
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Burgess to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Drogheda, in the room of Benjamin Whitworth, Esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Glyn*) *Feb* 19, [194] 151; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
After short debate, New Writ ordered (*Mr. Glyn*) *Mar* 5, 797

Dublin, Archbishop of
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1809; Comm. *cl.* 12, [197] 871; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 917; *cl.* 15, 919; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1164; *cl.* 19, 1262; 3R. Amendt. 1659; Commons Amendts. [198] 442, 443

Dublin City Election
Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Mar* 8, [194] 832; Observations, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, The Attorney General for Ireland; Reply, Mr. O'Reilly *Mar* 16, 1542
Election Inquiry—Minutes of Evidence—(*Parl. P.* No. 29)
Joint Address for a Commission, Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *April* 20, [195] 1270
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Dublin, in the room of Sir Arthur Edward Guinness, baronet, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Collins*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 192, N. 120; M. 72; main Question put, and agreed to; Message to the Lords thereon
l. Message from the Commons *April* 22
In the Commons Address to Her Majesty, Moved that the blank be filled up with ("Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and") (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 8, [196] 1394
Amendt. to leave out from ("the,") and insert ("said Address be taken into consideration this day six months") (*The Lord Cairns*); after short debate, Amendt. agreed to, and Address to be taken into consideration this day six months
Message to the House of Commons "That this House, having considered the report of the Judge appointed to try a petition complaining of an undue election and return for the city of Dublin, do not think it expedient to address Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to cause inquiry to be made pursuant to the provisions of the Act 31st and 32d Vict. chap. 125"

Dublin City Writ
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Dublin, in the room of Sir Arthur Guinness, baronet, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Noel*) *June* 14, [196] 1784

[*cont.*

Dublin City Writ—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "leave be given to bring in a Bill for disfranchising the Freemen of the City of Dublin" (*Sir George Grey*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 169, N. 215; M. 46
Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Debate adjourned, 1793
Question again proposed, "That those words, &c.;" Debate resumed *June* 17, [197] 126; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question, as amended, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for disfranchising the Freemen of the City of Dublin," put, and agreed to

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*)
c. Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for appointing Commissioners to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices amongst the Freemen Electors of the City of Dublin" (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *June* 29,
197] 819
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Colonel Taylor*); A. 52, N. 100; M. 48
Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Viscount Galway*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *July* 1, 950
After debate, Question put; A. 239, N. 136; M. 103
Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 189]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 5, 1174
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Frederick W. Heygate*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 246, N. 126; M. 120; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 9; Debate adjourned
198]Debate resumed *July* 19, 226
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to include in a Bill a Commission to inquire into corrupt practices at the Election for Youghal held in November last" (*Mr. Collins*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 184, N. 78; M. 106; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.;" put, and agreed to; Committee; Report
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 20
Considered * *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Lurgan*) *July* 22 (No. 210)
Read 2ª * *August* 2
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" (*The Lord Lurgan*) *August* 3, 1138
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Longford*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.? resolved in the affirmative; Committee; Report

Dublin Freemen Commission Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Lord Lurgan*) *August* 5, [198] 1285
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Longford*); after further short debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 3ª; after further short debate, Bill passed
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 65]

Dublin Freemen Disfranchisement Bill
(*Sir George Grey, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Whitbread*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 17 [Bill 168]
Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 19, [198] 158
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

DUFF, Mr. M. E. Grant (Under Secretary of State for India), *Elgin, &c.*
Army Estimates—Army Administration, [197] 148
Army—Medals for Service in India, [197] 625
Army—Camping System, Major M'Gwire's, Motion for Papers, [198] 723
Central Asia, [197] 1565
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1365, 1366; *cl.* 5, 1367; *cl.* 6, *ib.*
Governor General of India, Comm. [198] 1368
India—Questions, &c.
  Accounts, [195] 1578
  Affghanistan, Ameer of, [194] 955
  Appeals, [197] 1424
  Auditor General of Accounts, [197] 357
  Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, [194] 1462; [195] 1580
  Bank of Bengal, [196] 1237;—Bombay Branch, [198] 1295
  Bank of Bombay, [194] 1186
  Bhore Ghaut, Railway Accident at, [194] 485
  Budget, The, [194] 201
  Calcutta Port Dues, [198] 1091
  China—Route to, [198] 799
  Civil Service, [196] 1208
  Civil Service Examinations, [194] 841
  Communication with, [198] 1042
  Finance, [195] 478
  Fisheries, [197] 357
  Home Accounts, [197] 118
  Indian Field Officers, [195] 2
  Indian Officers, Return of, [194] 204
  Jhansi Prize Money, [194] 1466
  Jungera, Nawab of, [195] 231
  Kohat, Garrison of, [194] 488
  Medal for Bhootan, [197] 1424; [198] 1144
  Military Appointments, [194] 1655
  Morar—Barracks at, [197] 1418
  Muscat and Zanzibar, [195] 1581
  Mysore, Maharajah of, [196] 1495
  Native Scholarships, [194] 310
  Opium Trade, [198] 449
  Prince Azeem Jah, [198] 1091
  Punjaub Tenancy Act, [194] 1085; [196] 748, 1592; [198] 1145
  Railways, [196] 744; [197] 1424; [198] 797, 1091
  Rangoon and Western China, [195] 1356
  Revenues of, [196] 16

[*cont.*

DUFF, Mr. M. E. Grant—*cont.*
    Seat of Government, Removal of, [194] 312
    Telegraphic Communication, [198] 1490
    Tonk, Nawab of, [194] 311
  India—East India (Home Accounts), Motion for Papers, [197] 1329
  *India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1147, 1361
  Navy—"Crocodile" Transport, [195] 1198

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
  Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 634
  Imperial Gas, 2R. [195] 1787
  Supply—Report, [198] 692

DUFFERIN, Lord (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster)
  Common Law Courts (Ireland), 2R. [194] 481; Comm. *add. cl.* 1460; 3R. [195] 339
  Dublin Freemen Commission, 3R. [198] 1288, 1290
  Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 16, [198] 1068
  Ireland—Murders in, [194] 1622, 1634
    Police, [198] 669
    Portadown Inquest, [197] 1737; [198] 124
  Ireland—Crime, Address for Returns, [194] 948
  Ireland—Tithe Rent Charges, Motion for Returns, [194] 1081; [195] 451
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [197] 1129; *cl.* 46, 1165; *add. cl.* 1259; Report, 1491
  Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 986
  Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 571, 572
  Tenants Purchase by Instalments (Ireland), 2R. [198] 775
  Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1569

Dumfriesshire Election
  Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, to "consider whether Sir Sydney Hedley Waterlow is disqualified from sitting and voting as a Member of this House under the Statute 22 Geo. 3, c. 45, and to report their opinion thereon" (*Mr. Thomas Chambers*) *Feb* 22, [194] 190; after short debate, Motion agreed to
   And, on *Feb* 24, Committee nominated as follows: — Mr. Thomas Chambers (Chairman), The Lord Advocate, Mr. Brand, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Henley, and Mr. Pemberton
  Resolution [15th March] reported—"That Sir Sydney Hedley Waterlow is disqualified, under the Statute 22 Geo. 3, c. 45, from sitting and voting as a Member of this House;" Resolution agreed to; New Writ issued *Mar* 17, [194] 1561
  Government Contractors, Disqualification of, under 22 *Geo. III.* c. 45, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 2, [194] 482

DUNCOMBE, Hon. Colonel O., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
  Mines, Rating of, [195] 1582

DUNRAVEN, Earl of
  Irish Church, 3R. [197] 1641

DUNSANY, Lord
  Ireland—Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1088
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, Amendt. [197] 997; *cl.* 26, 1000; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1024; *cl.* 29, 1137
  Tenants Purchase by Instalments (Ireland), 2R. [198] 773, 776

Durham County Courts
  Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *April* 16, [195] 976

Durham, University of—University Tests Bill
  Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, The Solicitor General *Mar* 22, [194] 1897

DYOTT, Colonel R., *Lichfield*
  Assessed Rates, Consid. *add. cl.* [197] 1082
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 90, [197] 1757; *cl.* 101, 1764
  Poor Law—Magistrates and Boards of Guardians, [197] 119

East India Irrigation and Canal Company Bill (*Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19 [Bill 8]
  Read 2°* *Mar* 10, and referred to a Select Committee
  Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Harry Verney (Chairman), Colonel Amcotts, Mr. Robert N. Fowler, Mr. Muntz, and Mr. Pemberton
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 16
  Read 3°* *Mar* 17
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Argyll*) *Mar* 18
  Read 2ª* *April* 5 (No. 31)
  Report of Committee* *April* 6
  Committee* *April* 8
  Report* *April* 9
  Read 3ª* *April* 12
  Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 7]

East India Loan Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 29
  Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 30 [Bill 251]
  Read 2°* *August* 2
  Committee*—R.P. *August* 3
  Committee*; Report *August* 3
  Considered* *August* 4
  Read 3°* *August* 4
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Argyll*) *August* 5
  Read 2ª* *August* 6 (No. 267)
  Committee*; Report *August* 7
  Read 3ª* *August* 9
  Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 106]

East India Revenue Accounts
c. Considered in Committee *August* 3, [198] 1147
  Moved, "That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1868 was £48,534,412; the total of the direct claims upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium was £8,957,464; the charges in India,

[*cont.*

East India Revenue Accounts—cont.
including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £32,362,402; the value of Stores supplied from England was £970,926; the charges in England were £5,710,880; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,540,435, making a total charge for the same year of £49,542,107; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £1,007,695; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £602,462, and that including that charge the excess of Expenditure over Income was £1,610,157" (*Mr. Grant Duff*); after debate, Committee—R.P.
Considered in Committee *August* 5, 1343; after long time spent therein, Resolution agreed to
l. Statement of the Secretary of State for India (*The Duke of Argyll*) on presenting (by Command) Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India) (No. 219); also, Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9; long debate thereon *July* 23, [198] 521
Revenues of India—Authority of the Secretary of State, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *May* 3, [196] 16
(See *Weights and Measures* (*India*)

EASTWICK, Mr. E. B., *Penryn, &c.*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1432
Asia, Central, [195] 362; [197]* 1544
Barking Creek—Mortality at, [197] 514
Sewage Outfall, [196] 260
India—Civil Service, [196] 1208
Light Dues, Res. [196] 157
Mayors, Removal of, [196] 572
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 933
New York Mails, [195] 1583

EATON, Mr. H. W., *Coventry*
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 335
Police Interference, [195] 477

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Twenty-first Report—*Parl. P.* [4118]
Deanery of Lichfield and Rectory of Tatenhill, Question, Mr. M. A. Bass; Answer, Mr. Acland *Mar* 8, [194] 833
Estates of the Dean and Chapter, Question, Lord George Cavendish; Answer, Mr. Acland *April* 13, [195] 676

Ecclesiastical Courts Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 16 (No. 2)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 15, [195] 808; after debate, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
After short debate, Question, "That the Committee do consist of fifteen Members," put, and agreed to *April* 22, 1351
And, on *April* 26, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. Canterbury, L. Abp. York, Ld. President, M. Salisbury, E. Shaftesbury, E. Portsmouth, [*cont.*

Ecclesiastical Courts Bill—cont.
E. Carnarvon, E. Beauchamp, V. Halifax, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Bp. Ripon, L. Bp. Gloucester and Bristol, L. Portman, L. Westbury, L. Cairns
Report of Select Committee *July* 15 (No. 190)
Bill reported, with Amendts.* *July* 15 (No. 191)
Bill withdrawn *July* 29, [198] 885

Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of York*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 5 (No. 25)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 29, [195] 1818; after short debate, Motion and Bill withdrawn

Ecclesiastical Dilapidations (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Archbishop of York*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 29 (No. 82)
Read 2ª* *June* 24
Committee*; Report *June* 25 (No. 152)

Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal Bill
(*Mr. MacEvoy, Mr. William Gregory, Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Mr. Corbally*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. MacEvoy*) *Feb* 22, [194] 186; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1º*
Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Mr. MacEvoy *Mar* 1, 412; Question Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. MacEvoy *Mar* 2, 488
Bill withdrawn* *July* 5 [Bill 13]

Ecclesiastical Titles—Legislation
Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 5, [197] 1169

Education
Education in Large Towns, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 12, to leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the state of Education in the great Provincial Towns" (*Mr. Melly*), [194] 1189; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Primary Education, Question, Viscount Sandon; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *July* 19, [198] 152
Public Education in England, Ireland, and Scotland, Observations, Earl Russell; debate thereon *Mar* 8, [194] 805
Schools for Children of the Working Classes, Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 23, [194] 1996
Schools of Science—Science and Art Department, Question, Lord Henry Lennox; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 1, [197] 946; Observations, Mr. Samuelson; Reply, Mr. W. E. Forster *July* 19, [198] 158
Parl. Papers—
Report of Committee of Council, 1868-9 . . . . [4139]
Report on Technical Instruction . . . . [4151] [4207]
Science and Art Department [4103] [4136]
Revised Code of Regulations [4115]

Education Bill
(*The Lord Stratheden*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *August* 2 (No. 259)

Education of Children Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented ; read 1^a* *April* 29 (No. 88)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" *July* 13, [197] 1738
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Lord President*); on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2^a on this day three months

Egerton, Hon. A. F., *Lancashire, S.E.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry, [196] 1576
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1042 ; *cl.* 39, [196] 120
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1541

Egerton, Hon. Captain F., *Derbyshire, E.*
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1297
Navy—Channel and Mediterranean Fleets, [198] 797
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [195] 123

Egerton, Hon. W., *Cheshire, Mid.*
Bleachworks Act, [194] 629
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1816
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 680 ; Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1535
Parliament—Crypt under St. Stephen's Chapel, [195] 676
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1538

Egerton, Mr. E. C., *Cheshire, E.*
Austria—Commercial Treaty with, [196] 970
Cattle Plague (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1810
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 434 ; Comm. *cl.* 67, [197] 1537

Egerton of Tatton, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [198] 888

Egypt
Société Industrielle et Agricole d'Egypte, Question, Mr. Sidebottom ; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 5, [197] 1167 ; Question, Mr. White ; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 22, [198] 451
Suez Canal, Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 12, [197] 1664
The Viceroy—Present of a Steamer for the Albert Nyanza, Question, Mr. Buxton ; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 3, [196] 1205

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Accidents in Mines, [198] 685, 1517
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 857
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1129, 1165
Martial Law, [195] 661
Militia, [195] 667
Army—Government of the, [194] 203
Henry-Martini Rifle, [198] 1371
Wimbledon Review, [198] 1493
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1499, 1527, 1565
Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 965
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1715, 1718 ; Nomination of Committee, [196] 631, 636

[*cont.*

Elcho, Lord—*cont.*
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 586, 587 ; 2R. [198] 879
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [196] 251, 253
Irish Church, 3R. [196] 982, 1000
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1228
Metropolis—Statues in Palace Yard, [196] 1742
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [194] 133 ; Motion for a Committee, 277, 278
Navy—Admiralty Departments, Corruption in, [198] 1489
Parliament — Decoration of Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 718
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 282, 285
Parliament—Whitsuntide Holidays, [196] 809
198] Parochial Schools (Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 1, 822, 1101 ; *cl.* 2, 835 ; *cl.* 3, 837, 838 ; *cl.* 4, 1113, 1244, 1246, 1374, 1386, 1388 ; *cl.* 34, 1399 ; *cl.* 59, 1444 ; Consid. 1458, 1459, 1465 ; 3R. Amendt. 1494, 1498
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 917
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 523
South Kensington Museum, [197] 570
Supply, Report, [194] 537

Election Commissioners [Expenses] Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Resolution in Committee *May* 4
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1^o* *May* 5 [Bill 109]
Read 2^o* *May* 27
Committee *—R.P. *May* 28
Committee * ; Report *May* 31 [Bill 139]
Considered * *June* 3
Read 3^o * *June* 7
l. Read 1^a* (*Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 8 (No. 121)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" *June* 11, [196] 1588 ; Bill read 2^a
Committee * ; Report *June* 14
Read 3^a* *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 21]

Election Expenses Bill
(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Baines, Mr. M'Laren*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Fawcett*) *Feb* 19, [194] 150 ; Bill ordered ; read 1^o* [Bill 7]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^o" *Mar* 3, 563
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Floyer*) ; after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 165, N. 168 ; M. 3 ; words added ; main Question, as amended, agreed to ; Bill put off for six months ; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 583

Election Inquiries
Reports of the Judges on Election Inquiries, Observations, The Lord Chancellor *June* 7, [196] 1294 ; *June* 8, 1391
Question, Mr. Vernon Harcourt ; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 14, [194] 408 ; Observations, Mr. Vernon Harcourt ; Reply, The Attorney General *Mar* 5, 759
[See the several Cities and Boroughs]

[*cont.*

Election Inquiries—cont.
Undue Influence and Bribery—17 & 18 *Vict.* c. 102, Question, Mr. J. S. Hardy; Answer, The Solicitor General *June* 10, [196] 1497

Election Petitions
Parl. Papers—
Return of Commissions . . . 281
Return of Petitions . . . 107, 108
Judgments of the Judges . . 120, 121
Return of Costs 395

Elections (Wales)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the proceedings of certain landlords in Wales towards their tenants on account of the free exercise of the Franchise at Elections are oppressive and unconstitutional, and an infringement of the rights conferred by Parliament on the people of this country" (*Mr. Henry Richard*) *July* 6, [197] 1294; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

ELLENBOROUGH, Earl of
Government of India Act Amendment, Report, [196] 689, 694
Governor General of India, Comm. [195] 131

ELLICE, Mr. E., *St. Andrews, &c.*
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1120
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [196] 634
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 392
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 285
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 836; *cl.* 1, 1107; *cl.* 4, 1113; *cl.* 9, 1119; *cl.* 24, 1229

ELLIOT, Mr. G., *Durham, N.*
Coal Fields, Motion for an Address, [196] 1914
Supply—Poor Law Commission, [197] 1689

ELPHINSTONE, Sir J. D. H., *Portsmouth*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1437, 1439
Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 836
Army—Officers in China and Japan, [198] 904
Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 564
Cattle Plague, The, [194] 207
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Leave, [194] 94
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), [194] 1466; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1271; *cl.* 122, 1766
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 232, 233
Election Commissions, [196] 750
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Leave, [195] 756
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Commission, [195] 2065; Nomination of Committee, Amendt. [196] 628, 1783
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], 2R. [197] 503
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 884, 885
Government Reductions and Emigration, [195] 991
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. [197] 565
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 396
[*cont.*

ELPHINSTONE, Sir J. D. H.—*cont.*
India—Red Sea Route to, [198] 706
Ireland—State of, [195] 2032
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, Motion for reporting Progress, [195] 1155, 1156; *cl.* 39, [196] 274, 279, 346; *cl.* 59, 405
Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [197] 485
Navy—Questions, &c.
  Admiralty, Constitution of the Board of, [194] 304, 308
  Dockyard Distress, [195] 47, 49
  Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 374
  Naval Contracts, [198] 645
  Ryde Pier, [197] 358
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 83, 97, 98
  Half Pay, [195] 216
  Marine Divisions, [195] 185
  Men and Boys, [194] 914
  Salaries, Amendt. [195] 77, 83
  Steam Machinery, [195] 204, 206
  Victualling Yards, &c. [195] 183
Parliament — Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 191
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Re-comm. [198] 234, 816; *cl.* 2, 837
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1599
Scotland—Income Tax, [196] 389

ELY, Bishop of
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 615; *cl.* 15, 1881; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1882; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1883
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [197] 1151

Emigration and Pauperism
Observations, Lord Houghton; Reply, Earl Granville; debate thereon *April* 16, [195] 943
Emigration Commission, Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 12, [195] 579 29th Report—(*Parl. P.* [4159]
Emigration to Western Australia, Question, Mr. Alderman J. C. Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 5, [197] 1166
Dockyard Emigrants—(*Parl. P.* 354, 403)

Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Adam*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *April* 13, [195] 755; Bill ordered
Read 1°* *April* 14 [Bill 79]
Read 2°* *April* 22
Committee*; Report *May* 6 [Bill 110]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 13 [Bill 124]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*The Lord Advocate*) *June* 17, [197] 150
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Dr. Lyon Playfair*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to; Committee; Report
Considered* *June* 28
Read 3°* *July* 5
[*cont.*

Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Morley*) *July* 6 (No. 175)
Read 2ª * *July* 20
Committee * ; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 39]

Endowed Schools and Hospitals (*Scotland*)
Address for a Royal Commission "to inquire into the nature and amount of all Endowments in Scotland, the funds of which are devoted to the maintenance or education of young persons; also to inquire into the administration and management of any Hospitals or Schools supported by such Endowments, and into the system and course of study respectively pursued therein, and to report whether any and what changes in the administration and use of such Endowments are expedient, by which their usefulness and efficiency may be increased" (*Sir Edward Colebrooke*) *June* 8, [196] 1439; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate discharged *July* 19

Endowed Schools Bill
Betten's Charity, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *June* 21, [197] 356
Commissioners and Secretary, The, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 24, [197] 516

Endowed Schools Bill
(*Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. W. E. Forster*) *Feb* 18,
194] 113; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° *
. Question, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 9, 955
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, 1356; Bill read 2°, after long debate, and committed to a Select Committee
. Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 18, 1657
195] Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members" (*Mr. W. E. Forster*) *April* 1, 23; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. W. E. Forster (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Sir C. Adderley, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Goldney, Mr. George B. Gregory, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Melly, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Mowbray, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir John Pakington, Mr. C. S. Parker, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. John G. Talbot, Mr. S. H. Walpole, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Winterbotham
. Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Twenty-two Members" (*Mr. Crawford*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence added *April* 2, 123
. Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Twenty-three Members" (*Mr. James Lowther*); after short debate, Question negatived, [195] 124
Re-comm * ; Report *May* 11
Report of Select Comm. *June* 8 [*P. P.* 256]
Committee; Report *June* 14, [196] 1744
Considered * *June* 17
Read 3° * *June* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 22
[*cont.*

Endowed Schools Bill—cont.
197] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 28, 607; after debate, Bill read 2ª
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *July* 15, 1866; after debate, Committee, 1875
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 56]
Bill . . . . [Bill 3]
Report from Select Committee [*P.P.* 208]
Report and Special Report of Select Committee . . . . [*P.P.* 256]
As amended by Select Committee [Bill 115]
As amended by Select Committee, and on re-comm. . . . [Bill 163]
Bill . . . . (No. 139)
As amended in Committee . (No. 192)
As amended on Report . . . (No. 220)

Endowed Schools (No. 2) Bill
Formerly part of
Endowed Schools Bill
c. Committee * ; Report *June* 9
Bill withdrawn *August* 7, [198] 1466
Report and Special Report of Select Committee—*Parl. P.* 256
As amended on re-comm. 154

ENFIELD, Viscount, *Middlesex*
Abyssinian Expedition, [195] 30
Army—New Zealand War Medal, [194] 352
Dagenham Dock Company, [198] 1371
Hounslow Powder Mills, [197] 515
Juries, Special and Common, [194] 352
Metropolis—Finsbury Park, [196] 741
Nighthouses, [195] 1852
Metropolitan Police, [194] 1354
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 398

ERSKINE, Vice Admiral J. E., *Stirlingshire*
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 83, 86, 97
Dockyards, &c. [195] 114
Steam Machinery, [195] 206
South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 646
Ways and Means, Res. 2 (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 806

ESMONDE, Sir J., *Waterford Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1870; *cl.* 32, [196] 36; Lords Amendts. [198] 73, 98, 579
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 240
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 625

Established Church (*Ireland*)—See *Irish Church*

EVERSLEY, Viscount
Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 315

Evidence Amendment Bill—*Formerly*
Law of Evidence Bill
(*Mr. Denman, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Locke*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Denman*) *Feb* 26, [194] 406; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 25]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 28, [195] 1798
[*cont.*

Evidence Amendment Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Staveley Hill*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 10
Considered* *May* 27
Read 3°* *May* 28
Read 1ª* (*The Lord Penzance*) *June* 1 (No. 110)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 26, [198] 670; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *July* 30, 987 (No. 239)
Report* *August* 2 (No. 260)
Read 3ª* *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 68]

EWING, Mr. A. Orr, *Dumbarton*
*Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 846
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 369
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [198] 818, 1098; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 826, 835; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1114, 1116; *cl.* 17, 1123, 1124

EWING, Mr. H. E. CRUM- *Paisley*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 790; Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1408
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 122, [197] 1765
Cuba—Imprisonment of a British Subject, [194] 159
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 348
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], Leave, [194] 536
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 22, [195] 1516
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 822; *cl.* 2, 833, 1108; *cl.* 4, 1113; *cl.* 9, 1118; *cl.* 14, 1122
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 927
West Indies—Clergy in the, [194] 2001

Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866
Observations, Mr. Hunt; Reply, Mr. Candlish; short debate thereon *July* 5, [197] 1190

Exchequer Bonds (£2,300,000) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 152]
Read 2°* *June* 10
Committee*; Report *June* 11
Read 3°* *June* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *June* 15
Read 2ª* *June* 17
Committee*; Report *June* 18
Read 3ª* *June* 21
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 22]

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the, *see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER

EXETER, Marquess of
Militia, Comm. [195] 1846

Exeter, Port of
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *June* 14, [196] 1741

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 29 [Bill ~~245]~~
Read 2°* *July* 30
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 3 (No. 262)
Read 2ª* *August* 5
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª* *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict* c. 85]

Extradition, Law of
Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Otway *Mar* 16, [194] 1462
Treaty with France, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Earl of Clarendon *July* 23, [198] 554

EYKYN, Mr. R., *Windsor*
Army — Non-Purchase Corps, Promotion in, [198] 995
Betting Houses, [197] 514
India—Nawab of Jungera, [195] 231
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1218, 1224, 1226
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [196] 1450; Instruction, [197] 470
Navy—Naval Chaplains, [194] 1654
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 662
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 821, 823, 975

Factory Acts
Hours of Labour, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 29, [195] 1851
Workshops Regulation Act in Birmingham, Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 12, [195] 583

Factory and Workshops Act, 1867
Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 26, [198] 683
(See *Printworks Regulation*)

Factory Returns
Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 23, [194] 202
Factory Acts
See *Agricultural Labour Commission*
Bleachworks Acts
Printworks Regulation

Faraday, Proposed Monument to
Question, Dr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, [197] 1173

FAWCETT, Mr. H., *Brighton*
Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 110
Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 582, 606
Army—Expenditure on Fortifications, [195] 232, 233
Army—Horse Guards and the War Office, Res. [194] 1104
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 480, 487
196] Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. Amendt. 858, 864; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 868; *cl.* 4, 874; *cl.* 6, 876; *cl.* 7, 877, 1097
197] Consid. *add. cl.* 537, 539, 545, 549; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 551; *cl.* 6, 552
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [194] 1214
Election Expenses, Leave, [194] 150; 2R. 563, 582
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, [196] 1761
Inclosure Act, Motion for a Committee, [195] 1286
Inclosure of Lands, 3R. Amendt. [195] 547, 679, 680
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [198] 1197, 1208
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1487; *cl.* 32, [196] 23, 24; Amendt. 37, 42, 48; *cl.* 39, 338; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 407, 410; Lords Amendts. [197] 1949
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1092
  Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2070
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 823, 978, 980, 995, 1194, 1198, 1200
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 508
  Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 968, 972
University Tests, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1099, 1104
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 128

Feed Stuffs and Manures
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the attention of the Board of Trade should be directed to the adulteration of feed stuffs and manures" (*Lord Elcho*), [197] 965; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" put, and agreed to

Fever Patients, Conveyance of
Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 1, [194] 411; Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 4, 626

FEVERSHAM, Earl of
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 989
Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 387
Life Peerages, 2R. [195] 1676

FIELDEN, Mr. J., *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 571
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1775
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 121
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 533
Supply—Missions and Embassies Abroad, [198] 948

Fine Arts Copyright Consolidation and Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Westbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 26 (No. 17)
Bill withdrawn* *April* 12

Fine Arts Copyright Consolidation and Amendment (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Westbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 12 (No. 51)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 30, [195] 1936; after short debate, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 3, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Privy Seal, E. Stanhope, E. Carnarvon, E. Sommers, V. Hardinge, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Portman, L. Overstone, L. Lyveden, L. Westbury, L. Houghton, L. Romilly; *May* 4, The Duke of Saint Albans, The Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, and The Lord De L'Isle and Dudley added
Report of Select Comm. *June* 29
Report of Select Comm. *July* 9 (No. 181)

Fines and Fees Collection Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Staveley Hill*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *June* 10 [Bill 159]
Read 2º* *June* 18
Committee*; Report *June* 22
Re-comm.*; Report *June* 25 [Bill 171]
Considered* *June* 25
Read 3º* *June* 25
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 28
Read 2ª* *July* 20 (No. 155)
Committee* *July* 22
Report* *July* 23
Read 3ª* *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 49]

FINGALL, Earl of
Irish Church, Commons Amendt. [198] 439

Fire Insurance Duty
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Duty on Fire Insurances should be, at the earliest opportunity, reduced to 6*d.* per cent in place of the Duty of 1*s.* 6*d.* per cent now charged; and that such a reduction would have a tendency to improve the Revenue by inducing the insurance of property now uninsured" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *April* 6, [195] 305; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Septennial Policies, Question, Mr. H. Beaumont; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, [197] 1168

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *July* 1 [Bill 190]
Read 2º* *July* 5
Committee*; Report *July* 22
Considered* *July* 26
Read 3º* *July* 28

[*cont.*

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Dufferin*) *July* 29
Read 2ª* *July* 30 (No. 236)
Committee *August* 2, [198] 1067
Report *August* 3, 1138
Read 3ª* *August* 5
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 92]

Fitzwalter, Lord
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 41, Amendt. [197] 1159

Fletcher, Mr. J., *Cockermouth*
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 746

Floyer, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
Election Expenses, 2R. Amendt. [194] 577
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 496
Supply—British Museum, [198] 225

Forde, Colonel W. B., *Downshire*
Army—Training of the Irish Militia, [194] 125
Ireland—Cork, Meeting in, [196] 573

Fordyce, Mr. W. D., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Commission, [195] 2067
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], Leave, [194] 535; 2R. [197] 502
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 395
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 17, [198] 1123
Scotland—Salmon Fisheries, [195] 1196
Sea Birds Preservation, Consid. Amendt. [195] 557

Foreign Office Agencies
Question, Mr. T. Potter; Answer, Mr. Otway *Mar* 11, [194] 1083; Question, Sir Henry Bulwer; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 10, [198] 1534

Foreign Office—Unpaid Attachés
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the unpaid Attachés in the Diplomatic Service are entitled to salaries equal to those now given to the Junior Clerks in the Foreign Office" (*Mr. William Lowther*), [197] 1672; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Forester, Right Hon. Major General, *Wenlock*
Army—Household Cavalry, [196] 572

Forster, Right Hon. W. E. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Bradford*
Betten's Charity, [197] 356
Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 564
Carriage of Live Stock, [194] 630; [198] 1491
Cattle Disease in Roumania, [197] 1081

[cont.

Forster, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [194] 154, 205, 352
Cattle Plague, [194] 207
Conveyance of Cattle, [194] 630; [198] 1491
Diseased Foreign Sheep, [195] 1363, 1364, 1468, 1696, 1698; [197] 949
Foot and Mouth Disease, [198] 1252
Slaughter of Cattle, [198] 1492
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1030, 1466, 1467
194] Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, 672, 678, 682
195] 2R. 447
196] 1498
197] Comm. *cl.* 15, 1271, 1272, 1282, 1288, 1290; *cl.* 16, 1292; *cl.* 22, *ib.*; *cl.* 27, 1293; *cl.* 34, *ib.*; *cl.* 45, 1294, 1528; *cl.* 54, *ib.*; *cl.* 63, 1530, 1532; Amendt. 1533, 1534, 1535; *cl.* 64, *ib.*; *cl.* 67, 1537, 1539, 1540; *cl.* 73, *ib.* Amendt. 1541; *cl.* 88, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 90, 1757, 1758, 1759; *cl.* 96, 1761; *cl.* 98, 1762, 1763; *cl.* 101, 1764; *cl.* 7, 1766; *add. cl.* 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1774
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1235
Education, Primary, [198] 152
Education—Schools for Children of the Working Classes, [194] 1997
Education Votes, [197] 515
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 158
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 113, 116, 121; 955; 2R. 1356, 1658; Motion for a Committee, [195] 23, 24, 123, 124
196] Comm. *cl.* 9, 1744, 1746, 1748; *cl.* 10, 1748, 1750, 1751; *cl.* (A.) 12, 1760; *cl.* 13, 1765; *cl.* 15, 1766, 1768; *cl.* 19, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771; *cl.* 29, 1772, 1774, 1776, 1777; *cl.* 31, 1778, 1779; *cl.* 35, 1779; *cl.* 36, 1780; *cl.* 38, *ib.*; *cl.* 41, 1781, 1782
198] Re-comm. 1466, 1467
Metropolitan Cattle Market, [196] 15
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1093, 1094
198] Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 826, 833, 834; *cl.* 1, 1108; *cl.* 6, 1115, 1116, 1117; *cl.* 24, 1234, 1242; *cl.* 44, 1392, 1393; Consid. 1454, 1456, 1457, 1458
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 656, 670
Pharmacy Act Amendment, Leave, [194] 683; Comm. [195] 1933
Schools of Science, [198] 162
South Kensington Museum, [196] 1636; [197] 570
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 162, 184, 197
Science and Art Department, [198] 200, 217
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1385

Forster, Mr. C., *Walsall*
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 329, 842; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 371; *add. cl.* 534
Law of Forfeiture on Conviction of Felony, [197] 1542
Ratepaying Clauses, [194] 127
Taxes, Collection of, [194] 766
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 414

FORTESCUE, Earl
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 620; Comm. *cl.* 14, 1878
India—Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 553
India — Weights and Measures, Address for Papers, [198] 795

FORTESCUE, Right Hon. Chichester S. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Louth Co.*
Army—Training of the Irish Militia, [194] 125
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1177; Comm. [198] 231
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1850; [198] 839
Anketell, Mr., Murder of, [194] 1091; [197] 351
Ballyheigue, Affray at, [196] 1207
Beerhouses, Licensing of, [195] 309
Caledon—12th July in, [198] 448
Church Leases, [195] 1095
Clerk of the Crown for King's County, [197] 1422
Cork, Mayor of, [195] 359
Cork, Meeting in, [196] 574
Cullen, Cardinal, and the Privy Council, [194] 483
Derry, Proclamation of, [196] 104, 263
District Asylums, [198] 684
Dundalk and Louth, Proclamation of, [197] 1666
Education, National, [194] 1898
Education—Salaries of Teachers, [195] 1698
Fenianism, [194] 159, 161, 209, 311, 954, 1659, 1661, 1904, 1998; [195] 357
Fercal, Union of, [196] 1206
Firearms, Use of, by the Irish Constabulary, [197] 1668
Fisheries Commission, [195] 358
Glebes and Glebe Houses, [198] 1088
Grand Jury Laws, [194] 157
Inflammatory Speeches, [194] 1349, 1351
Landlord and Tenant, Law of, [194] 353
Londonderry, Riot in, [195] 1848; [196] 20, 102, 104, 390, 749;—Proclamation of, [197] 1668
Lunatics, [198] 683
Maynooth College, [194] 1091, 1465; [195] 50
Municipal Franchise, [194] 1186
Orangeism, [197] 360
Polling Places, [194] 835
Poor Law, [194] 111;—Commissioners, 1466
Portadown, Riots at, [197] 1170, 1171, 1665, 1666
Prisons, [195] 1855
Protection of Life, [196] 470
Rates on Disturbed Districts, [196] 21
Representation of, [194] 363
Roscommon and Galway Lunatic Asylum, [197] 313
St. Patrick's Day in Dublin, [195] 230
Seditious Language in the Queen's Colleges, [197] 517
State Aid to Irish Nonconformists, [198] 153
State of, [195] 1990, 2052
Tarleton, Captain, Assassination of, [195] 1849
Tipperary, Extra Police in, [196] 744
[*cont.*

FORTESCUE, Right Hon. Chichester S.—*cont.*
Tralee Gaol, [196] 1630
Wetherall, Sir E. R., Appointment of, [194] 747, 755
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 720
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1165, 1166
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [198] 1205
Ireland—Ulster, Recent events in, Motion for Papers, [198] 354
194] Irish Church, 2R. 1745
195] Comm. *cl.* 10, 1104, 1105; *cl.* 13, 1134,
. 1136; *cl.* 14, 1138, 1375; *cl.* 15, 1398; *cl.* 18,
. 1414, 1478; *cl.* 22, 1517; *cl.* 23, 1528; *cl.* 25,
. 1597, 1605, 1614; *cl.* 26, 1628, 1629; *cl.* 27,
. 1629; *cl.* 29, 1918, 1922, 1929
196] *cl.* 36, 72; *cl.* 37, 74; *cl.* 39, 129, 295;
. *cl.* 59, 403, 410, 413, 419; Consid. 769
197] Lords Amendts. 1949; Amendt. 1958, 1977
198] 26, 98, 122, 587
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 497
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 213
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 88
Business of the House, [194] 1093
Morning Sittings, [195] 1980
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1558; [197] 864, 868, 1590
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 327, 335
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [194] 994; Comm. [196] 1455
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1546
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1487
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 738
Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 514

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Captain Vivian*)
c. Resolutions in Committee *July* 16
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 19 [Bill 223]
Read 2°* *July* 22
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Cardwell*) *July* 30, [198] 1003
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Taylor*); Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 100; N. 32; M. 68; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker &c." put, and agreed to; Committee; Report, 1008
Read 3°* *July* 31
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Northbrook*) *August* 2 (No. 251)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *August* 3, 1139; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee*; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 76]

FOTHERGILL, Mr. R., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Ireland—State of, [195] 2002
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 977

Fowler, Mr. R. N., *Penryn, &c.*
Bristol Pilots at Falmouth, [198] 1528
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1100
British Subjects in the Levant, [198] 1250
Cape of Good Hope—Boers of the Trans-Vaal Republic, [197] 1342
  Enslavement of Kaffir Children, [194] 128
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 856
Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol, [198] 1051
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1193
Ireland—St. Patrick's Day in Dublin, [195] 230
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1121
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1226
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [196] 1450
Mauritius—Famine, Reported, [194] 1657
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 474
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 1246
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 924
  West India Mails, [195] 574
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 993
Sierra Leone—Thomas v. Huggins, Case of, [198] 1216
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [197] 683

Fowler, Mr. W., *Cambridge Bo.*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1411; *cl.* 126, 1903
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 831
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1842
Real Property, Res. [196] 586, 602
South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 645
Supply—Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1464
  Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 678
  House of Commons Offices, [197] 1477
  Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 973
Telegraph, Comm. [198] 747; 3R. 977
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1447; Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1102
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 425; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), 617

France
Claims of British Subjects under Convention of Paris, 1815, *and Treaties of* 1814 *and* 1815, Motion for Papers (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *June* 8, [196] 1445; after short debate, A. 80, N. 109; M. 29
Commercial Treaty, The, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 18, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Commercial Treaty with France, ratified the 13th day of January 1860, and particularly as it affects the Silk Manufacture in this Country" (*Mr. Staveley Hill*), [197] 329; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 155, N. 101; M. 54
Extradition Treaty with France, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Earl of Clarendon *July* 23, [198] 554
  Channel Passage—(*Parl. P.* No. 353)

Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy by the Mayor of Birmingham—(See *Murphy's Lectures*)

French, Right Hon. Colonel F., *Roscommon Co.*
Army—Militia, Training of the Irish, [194] 125
Barking Creek, River Thames at, [196] 1402
Church Rates—Private Acts, [195] 1854
Ireland — Roscommon and Galway Lunatic Asylum, [197] 313
  Salmon Passes on the Shannon, [197] 648
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 715
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 53; *cl.* 33, 54; Lords Amendts. [197] 1907
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 235
Parliament—Business of the House, [198] 157
  Dublin City Writ, [197] 133
  Whitsuntide Holidays, [196] 21
Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 270
Revising Barristers, Appointment of, [198] 1487
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), [196] 24, 1489
Statute Law, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1253
Supply—Dublin Metropolitan Police, [198] 912
  Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [198] 912
  Landed Estates Court (Ireland), [198] 911
  Probate Courts, [198] 909
  Public Works (Ireland) (Salaries), [198] 743

Friendly Societies' Acts
Question, Mr. W. Lowther; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 29, [198] 896
  (See title *Trades Unions*)

Friendly Societies—Law in Relation to
Observations, Mr. E. Richards; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *April* 9, [195] 508

Friendly Societies' Returns
Question, Mr. W. Lowther; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 25, [197] 571

Gallwey, Sir W. P., *Thirsk*
Packet Service between England and France, [198] 154
Supply—Works, &c. [197] 1708

Galway, Viscount, *Retford (East)*
Dublin Freemen, Leave, Motion for Adjournment, [197] 820
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 358
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1792
  Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2072
Taxes on Servants, [196] 1097, 1098
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1378
Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 799, 800

Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol
Observations, Mr. Buxton; Reply, Mr. Monsell; short debate thereon *July* 30, [198] 1048

Game Laws (*Scotland*)
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the operation and effect of the Laws in Scotland relating to Game" (*Mr. Loch*) *April* 27, [195] 1713 ; after debate, Motion agreed to ; Select Committee appointed
Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Eighteen Members" (*Mr. Loch*) *May* 11, [196] 628
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Order for the appointment of the said Select Committee be discharged" (*Sir James Elphinstone*) ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 14, [196] 1783 ; after short debate, Order discharged
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 30, To leave out from "That," and add "the question of the Game Laws in Scotland be referred to a Royal Commission" (*Sir James Elphinstone*), [195] 2065 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Game Laws (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. Orr Ewing*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. M'Lagan*) *Mar* 2, [194] 534 ; Bill ordered, after short debate ; read 1° * [Bill 32]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 23, [197] 499 ; after short debate, Bill withdrawn

Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill
(*Lord Elcho, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Lord Elcho*) *Mar* 3, [194] 586 ; Bill ordered, after short debate ; read 1° * [Bill 36]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 28, [198] 879 ; after short debate, Debate adjourned

Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Loch, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Parker*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 47]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 28

GARLIES, Lord, *Wigtonshire*
Army—Armament of Sea and Land Defences, [197] 141
Branding in the, [195] 573 ; [196] 573
Army Estimates — Hospital Establishment, [195] 666
Land Forces, [194] 1151
Martial Law, [195] 662
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 388
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 806, 807 ; *cl.* 19, 1124
Scotland—Ayrshire, Distributor of Stamps for, [198] 1144
Portpatrick Harbour, [194] ; 110, 367 ; [195] 983
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1272
Volunteers, Ammunition for the, [196] 1591

GILPIN, Colonel R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1533
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 574
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1413, 1416 ; *cl.* 29, 1932 ; Lords Amendts. Motion for Adjournment, [197] 1986, 1987
Militia, Comm. [195] 1417

GILPIN, Mr. C., *Northampton Bo.*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 535
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1410
Cape Colony—Enslavement of Kaffir Children, [194] 132
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 840, 848, 874
Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 551
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1771
India—Bank of Bengal, [198] 1295
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 123
Merchant Seamen, Diet of, [194] 1463
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 983
Salisbury Magistrates, The, [196] 1620
Supply—Poor Law Commission, [197] 1691
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 663

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Greenwich*
Asia, Central, [195] 362 ; [197] 1580
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 379, 390, 394 ; *cl.* 4, 527
Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 631
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 321, 328, 329
198] Bishops Resignation, 2R. 1125 ; Comm.
. 1297, 1314 ; *cl.* 2, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1320,
. 1321, 1322 ; *cl.* 3, 1322, 1323 ; *cl.* 5, 1323,
. 1324 ; *cl.* 11, 1324
Bishops, Retirement of, [195] 581
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 121
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1124
Canada—Railway Loan, Res. [197] 1452
Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1329
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1817
Church Temporalities (Ireland) Commissioners, Comm. [195] 1531
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 494
196] Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. 863, 864 ;
. *cl.* 1, 869, 870 ; *cl.* 2, 871 ; *cl.* 3, 872 ; *cl.* 4,
. 873, 874, 875 ; *cl.* 5, 876 ; *cl.* 6, *ib.* ; *cl.* 7,
. 877, 1097
197] Consid. 539, 542, 548 ; *cl.* 3, 552 ; *cl.* 6,
. Amendt. 553
Civil Service Appointments, [195] 40
Clergy, The, and Parliament, [196] 746
Contagious Diseases, [194] 303
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1268
Courts of Justice, Site, [198] 1144
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [196] 585
Diplomatic Service, Expenses of the, [194] 836
Dublin Freemen Commission, Leave, [197] 820 ; Comm. [198] 233
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1747 ; [197] 516
Episcopal Clergy, Disabilities of the, [195] 1466, 1467
Financial Statement—Corn Duty, [195] 479
Fire Insurances, Res. [195] 308
Gladstone, Mr., and the Independent Orange Association, [197] 1890

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Government Contractors, [194] 482
Greece—British Payments to, [194] 1896
Inclosure of Lands, 3R. [195] 557
Ireland—Questions, &c.
  Church Leaseholds, [195] 1096
  Church Property, [194] 1087, 1351
  Established Church—Value of Endowments, [194] 839
  Impropriate Tithe Rent-Charge, [195] 1974
  Irish Church Funds, Surplus of, [198] 156
  Irish Clergy, Future Status of the, [195] 1198
  Landlord and Tenant, Law of, [194] 353
  Lavelle *v.* Proudfoot, Case of, [196] 885
  Lord Lieutenant, Rumoured Resignation of, [194] 2003
  Maynooth College, [194] 1658; [195] 316, 680;—Professors of, [196] 748
  Mayor of Cork, [194] 1999
  Prelates of the Irish Church, [196] 261
  Property of the Irish Church, [194] 1461
  Railways, Purchase of, [195] 1577
  Sligo Election, [195] 974
  State of, [195] 2020, 2024, 2025, 2053
  Valentia, Living of, [194] 482
  Wetherall, Sir E. R., Appointment of, [194] 756
194] Irish Church, Leave, 412, 468, 469; 2R. 1662, 1680, 1829, 2106, 2111, 2121, 2126;
195] 356; Comm. 924; *cl.* 2, 1044, 1058; *cl.* 3, 1099, 1100; *cl.* 7, 1100; *cl.* 10, 1101, 1106; *cl.* 12, 1109; Amendt. 1110, 1111, 1116; *cl.* 13, 1137; *cl.* 14, 1152, Motion for reporting Progress, 1157, 1357, 1367, 1370; Amendt. 1378, 1379, 1384, 1385, 1386; *cl.* 15, 1387, 1389, 1392; Amendt. 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1404, 1408; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1410, 1411, 1412; *cl.* 18, 1412, 1413, 1415, 1416, 1475, 1485, 1488; *cl.* 19, 1489; *cl.* 20, 1495, 1497, 1504; *cl.* 22, 1510, 1514, 1517; *cl.* 23, 1520, 1521; *cl.* 24, 1585; *cl.* 25, 1592, 1596, 1598, 1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1614, 1615, 1616; *cl.* 26, 1624, 1628; *cl.* 27, 1633, 1634, 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1856; *cl.* 28, 1881; *cl.* 29, 1904, 1922, 1927, 1931, 1932
196] *cl.* 32, 24, 33, 41; Amendt. 43, 46, 47, 52; *cl.* 33, 64; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 66, 67, 68; *cl.* 37, 73, 75; *cl.* 39, 110, 120; Amendt. 132, 133, 136, 137, 139, 146, 147, 148, 268, 269, 270, 281; Amendt. 301, 319, 337, 346; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 349; *cl.* 58, 350; Amendt. 391; *cl.* 59, 398, 407, 409, 410, 417, 419, 420; *cl.* 61, 421; *cl.* 62, 421; *cl.* 3, 421, 423; *add. cl.* 423, 425, 426; Consid. *add. cl.* 751, 757, 760, 765, 767, 769, 773, 774; Amendt. 778, 779, 780; 3R. 1060
197] Lords Amendts. 1891; Amendt. 1897, 1916, 1924; Amendt. 1946, 1948, 1952, 1953; Amendt. 1955; Amendt. 1959, 1960; Amendt. 1961, 1963, 1964; Amendt. 1965, 1976, 1977; Amendt. 1978, 1986, 1993
198] Amendt. 21, 47, 51; Amendt. 52, 98, 99, 103, 564
Irish Church—Organists, [195] 1197
Law Courts, New, Motion for a Committee, [197] 458, 463
Light Dues, Res. [196] 184
Local Museums, [197] 946
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 265; [195] 978

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 748
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Instruction, [197] 462; Comm. [198] 359
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1132
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 963
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1959
Navy—Lord High Admiral, Office of, [194] 627
  Slave Trade, West Coast of Africa, [194] 831
Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1628
Navy Estimates—Salaries, [195] 80
O'Farrell Papers, The, [195] 1468, 1470, 1584, 1854, 2064
Official Salaries, [195] 27
O'Sullivan's Disability, [196] 185, 186; Leave, 212, 219; 2R. Amendt. 577, 581, 584
Park Lane and Piccadilly Thoroughfare, Motion for Papers, [195] 757
Parliament—Questions, &c.
  Business of Parliament, Lords Message, [194] 1560
  Business of the House, [194] 1092, 1093, 1459; [195] 846, 1470, 1472; [198] 157, 158, 1092, 1296, 1297
  Dublin City Writ, [196] 1792, 1793
  Easter Recess, [194] 157
  Public Business, [197] 1669
  Whitsuntide Holidays, [196] 21, 104, 585, 809
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 74; Report, 106, 164
Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 301, 302
Parliament—Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Res. [197] 964
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [195] 1856; Res. 1975, 1978, 1980, 1981
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 660; Instruction to Committee, 1518
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1559
Pensions for Civil Offices, Res. [194] 165
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 256
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [196] 1156, 1157, 1160
Post Office—Mail Packet Service, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1307
Ratepaying Clauses, [194] 127
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 967
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 977
Registration of Householders, [194] 158
Representation of Minorities, [197] 124
Representation of the People Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 511; 2R. [196] 1334
Representative Peers (Scotland and Ireland), Leave, [194] 987
Revenue Officers, Leave, [194] 272, 1592
Scotland—Queen's Remembrancer, [194] 1187
Slave Trade—Brazilian Vessels, [194] 354
Statute Law, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1249
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 464, 466
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 647
  Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 530, 543
  Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1438

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
- Science and Art Department, [198] 213
- Stationery Office, [197] 1698
- United States—Recent Negotiations with, [197] 1425
- University Tests, 2R. [194] 1051; Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 796
- Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 221
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 411, 414; Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), 598, 600
- Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 127
- Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 625

GLADSTONE, Mr. W. H., *Whitby*
- University Tests, Comm. [197] 780

GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL, Bishop of
- Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1743
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [198] 887; Comm. *cl.* 64, Amendt. 990, 992
- Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 621; Comm. *cl.* 15, 1882
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1344
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [197] 749; *cl.* 28, 1033; *cl.* 69, 1261; Report, Amendt. 1488; Commons Amendts. [198] 443
- Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. 2R. [198] 890, 891
- University Tests, 2R. [198] 136

GLYN, Mr. G. G., *Shaftesbury*
- Parliament—Drogheda Writ, [194] 151, 797
  - Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2068

Gold Coinage, The
- *Gold Coinage*, Observations, Mr. J. B. Smith; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *August* 6, [198] 1408; Question, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, 1532
- *Melting of English Sovereigns*, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [198] 1527
  - Coinage 1859 to 1868—(*Parl. P.* No. 157)

GOLDNEY, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
- Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 497
- Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 325; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 385, 386, 394
- Copyhold, Inclosure, and Charity Commissions, [195] 141
- County Coroners, Leave, [195] 752
- Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 560
- Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1393; Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1747; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1768, 1769; *cl.* 29, 1772; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 1780
- Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1788
- Inclosure of Lands, 3R. [195] 555
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [195] 1124, 1126; *cl.* 14, 1152; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1412, 1413, 1415, 1473, 1479; *cl.* 32, [196] 40, 53
- Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1227
- Metropolis—New Public Offices, [197] 1669

[*cont.*

GOLDNEY, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 1472
  - New Writs, [194] 18
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 662
- Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1242
- Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 963; 2R. [197] 1845
- Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 465
- Supply—Board of Trade, [197] 1682
  - Burlington House, Amendt. [197] 1213
  - Charity Commission, [197] 1683
  - Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 538
  - County Courts, [198] 908
  - Education, Public, [198] 192
  - Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1480
  - House of Lords Offices, [197] 1476
  - Land—New Palace, Westminster, [197] 679
  - Land Registry Office, [198] 910
  - National Gallery, [198] 503
  - Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1703
  - Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211; [198] 909
  - Public Offices Site, [197] 1201, 1203, 1204, 1208
  - Royal Palaces, [197] 653
  - Royal Parks, &c. Amendt. [197] 665, 673
  - Tithe Commission, [197] 1684
  - Works, &c. [197] 707
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 409

GOLDSMID, Sir F. H., *Reading*
- Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 166; Comm. *cl.* 59, [196] 1600
- County Courts, 2R. Amendt. [194] 1563; [196] 684
- Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 792

GORE, Mr. W. R. ORMSBY- *Leitrim Co.*
- Ireland—Railways, Purchase of, [195] 1577
  - Shannon Salmon Fisheries, [196] 743
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 86

GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J. (Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board), *London*
- Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 315, 628, 842; [195] 842; 2R. [196] 1299
- 197] Comm. *cl.* 1, 372, 383, 385, 386, 390, 392, 396, 397, 398; *cl.* 4, 520, 524, 528; Amendt. 529, 531; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 533; *add. cl.* 534, 535, 536; Consid. *add. cl.* 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089
- Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1407
- Birmingham—District Medical Officers, [194] 1089;—Board of Guardians, 1902
- Catholic Children in Workhouses, [197] 1419
- District Asylums, [194] 1899
- Emigration of Paupers, [194] 627
- Fever Patients, Conveyance of, [194] 626
- Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1816
- Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 241; [195] 358
- Metropolis—St. Marylebone Workhouse, [197] 944
  - St. Pancras Workhouse, [197] 1754, 1820

[*cont.*

GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J.—*cont.*
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1130
- Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 1534, 1535; 2R. [196] 946, 963, 1364, 1368
- Orphan Pauper Children, [195] 971
- Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 521
- Poor Law—Questions, &c.
  - Gilbert Unions, [194] 626; [195] 1195, 1196
  - Keighley Union, [198] 892
  - Kensington Sick Asylum District, [195] 841
  - Magistrates and Boards of Guardians, [197] 120
  - Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, [195] 1355
  - Payment of Rates by Owners, [194] 409
  - Sick Poor Asylums, [194] 954
  - Vagrants in Sacks—Narberth Union, [197] 308, 1890
- Poor Law—Removal of Children, Res. [197] 1337, 1340
- Poor Rates, Exemption from, [194] 356
- Poor Relief Assessment, [194] 485
- Rateable Property, Leave, [194] 185
- Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 170, 183
- Rates and Taxes, Collection of, [194] 839
- Rating of Mines, [194] 407
- Rating of Woods, [194] 411
- Sunday and Ragged Schools, 2R. [196] 1969
- Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 514
  - Poor Law Commission, [197] 1689, 1692
- Union of Parishes in Westminster, [198] 1145
- Vagrancy, [195] 1096; [198] 157
- Valuation of Property, [194] 1661
- Valuation of Property (Metropolis), 2R. [195] 22, 359; Comm. *cl.* 11, [197] 1482, 1483; *cl.* 53, Amendt. 1483

GOUGH, Viscount
- Irish Church, Report, Amendt. [197] 1503; 3R. Amendt. 1660

GOURLEY, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
- Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1333
- Cabs and Omnibuses, Licenses on, [198] 1541
- Colonies, Grants in Aid, [198] 960
- Cuba—Seizure of the "Mary Lowell" in British Waters, [196] 264
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 26, [196] 854
- Egypt—Suez Canal, [197] 1664; [198] 1087
- Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1516
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 922
- Navy—Reserve Channel Squadron, [196] 1236
- Poor Relief Assessment, [194] 485
- Staines, Burglaries at, [198] 1542
- Trades Unions, Funds of, [194] 112
- Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 624

Government Annuities, &c. Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stansfeld*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 70]
- Read 2°* *June* 7
- Bill withdrawn* *August* 5

Government Contractors, 22 *Geo. III. c.* 45
- Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 2, [194] 482
- (See *Dumfriesshire Election*)

Government of India Act Amendment Bill
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
- 195] *l.* Notice *April* 6, 222
- . Presented; read 1ª, after debate *April* 19, 1069
- . Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 29, 1821; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 62)
- Committee* *May* 7 (No. 94)
- 196] Report *May* 13, 689
- . Amendt. moved to omit "elected or" (*The Marquess of Salisbury*); after short debate, Cont. 89, Not-Cont. 53; M. 36; resolved in the affirmative; Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 697
- Moved, to insert a new clause (*The Marquess of Salisbury*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn (No. 104)
- . Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *June* 4, 1236; after short debate, Bill read 3ª
  - As amended by Commons (No. 290)
- *c.* Read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 150]
- Read 2°* *June* 21
- Committee; Report *August* 5, [198] 1361
- Considered* *August* 6
- Read 3°* *August* 6
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 97]

Government Securities, Dividends on—Transmission of Warrants
- Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 27, [198] 800

Governor General of India Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
- *l.* Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 26 (No. 16)
- Bill read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 11, [194] 1055
- Committee *April* 5, [195] 130 (No. 42)
- Report* *April* 9
- Read 3ª* *April* 19
  - As amended by Commons (No. 291)
- *c.* Read 1°* *April* 21 [Bill 89]
- Read 2°* *June* 21
- Committee; Report *August* 5, [198] 1368
- Considered* *August* 6
- Read 3°* *August* 6
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 98]

GOWER, Lord R. S. Leveson-, *Sutherlandshire*
- Metropolis—Burlington House, [194] 1351

GOWER, Hon. E. F. Leveson, *Bodmin*
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1847

GRAHAM, Mr. W., *Glasgow*
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [196] 259; [198] 387
- Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 805; *cl.* 1, 823, 1106; *cl.* 19, 1124; *cl.* 24, 1240, 1243; *cl.* 34, 1391; Consid. 1459
- Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1308

GRANARD, Earl of
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 13, [197] 884; Report, 1499; 3R. 1640

Grand Jury Cess (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Stacpoole, Colonel Greville-Nugent*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 18 [Bill 60]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 4

GRANVILLE, Earl (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
Appropriation of Property, Motion for a Return, Amendt. [194] 689
Assessed Rates, 2R. [197] 1752
Bankruptcy, [194] 97, 103; Comm. [198] 681
Bishops of Protestant Churches, [196] 1281
Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 10
Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 480; 3R. 829
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 10, 15, 16, 36
Canning Statue, The, [198] 1484
China—Missionaries in, [194] 933
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. [196] 85
Coronation Oath, [195] 1066, 1069
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [198] 1079; Comm. 1138; 3R. 1286, 1287, 1290
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c. 2R. [195] 833; Nomination of Committee, 1353, 1536
Ecclesiastical Titles, [197] 1169
Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1874
Furious Riding, Conviction for, [197] 1106
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1332
Hudson's Bay Company, [194] 798
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1350
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1533, 1534, 1535
Bills relating to, [194] 199
Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 362, 373
Mayor of Cork—Assassinations, [195] 1951; [196] 77
Murders in, [194] 1635, 1642, 1648
State of, [195] 1956, 1971; [196] 715, 720
Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1089
Ireland—Crime, Address for Returns, [194] 951
Irish Church, [196] 1580; 2R. 1637, 1666;
197] 301, 353; Comm. 686; Preamble, 710, 730; *cl.* 2, 744; *cl.* 6, 753, 754; *cl.* 9, 759; *cl.* 11, 869; *cl.* 12, 870, 871; *cl.* 13, 874, 876, 883, 885; *cl.* 14, 890, 897, 902, 913, 916; *cl.* 16, 922; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 923; *cl.* 23, 940; *cl.* 25, 997; *cl.* 26, 999; *cl.* 27, 1007; *cl.* 28, 1025, 1048; *add. cl.* 1109; *cl.* 29, 1123, 1125, 1126, 1127; *cl.* 33, 1156; *cl.* 35, 1158; *cl.* 45, 1164; *cl.* 68, 1231, 1232, 1253; *cl.* 22, 1268; Preamble, *ib.*; Report, 1486, 1488; Amendt. 1490, 1491, 1494, 1495, 1511, 1517, 1518, 1521, 1524; 3R. 1614, 1651
198] Commons Amendts. 235, 243, 260, 309, 312, 313, 315; Motion for Adjournment, 323, 406, 440, 443, 447
Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 469, 471; 2R. 1662, 1665; Comm. [196] 1192; *cl.* 1, 1202; Report, 1388; 3R. [197] 1325
National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 652, 664; Res. 1142
New Zealand, War in, [194] 332; [198] 783

[*cont.*

GRANVILLE, Earl—*cont.*
Oriel College, Oxford, 2R. [194] 804
Parliament—Questions, &c.
Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 46, 104, 153
Adjournment, [194] 15
Business of the House, [198] 14, 15
Easter Recess, [194] 798
Morning Sittings, [197] 1188
Order in the House, [197] 401, 408; [198] 149
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 8, 11
Parliament—Despatch of Business, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1309
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 592, 618, 620, 799, 800
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Report, [196] 1285; [198] 1451; Commons Amendts. 1471, 1482
Party Processions (Ireland), [197] 1172
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 952
Poor in England and Wales, Motion for a Commission, [197] 399
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1690, 1691
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 572
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1163, 1190; Comm. 1536, 1557, 1558, 1560, 1571

Gravesend County Court
Question, Sir Charles Wingfield; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *April* 26, [195] 1579

GRAVES, Mr. S. R., *Liverpool*
Assessed Rates, Consid. [197] 1085
Board of Trade Returns, [198] 697
Clearing Vessels at the Custom House, [197] 1754
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 399
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1851
State of, [195] 1982
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1024; *cl.* 14, 1150
Light Dues, Res. [196] 175
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 85
Men and Boys, [194] 923
Steam Machinery, [195] 206
Navy—Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 376
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 677
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 233, 252
Post Office — Mail Packet Contracts, [194] 1186; Motion for a Committee, 1292; Res. [196] 1139
Sunday and Ragged Schools, 2R. [196] 1967
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 3, [198] 765; *cl.* 5, 771

GRAY, Sir J., *Kilkenny Bo.*
General Council of Medical Education, &c. [197] 1269, 1270
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1795
Ireland—O'Donovan Rossa, Case of, [196] 1238, 1243
Orangeism, [197] 359, 360
State of, [195] 2060
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1170
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1831; Comm. *cl.* 23, [195] 1529; *cl.* 25, 1616; *cl.* 27, 1874; Lords Amendts. [198] 588

[*cont.*

Gray, Sir J.—*cont.*
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 491
Newspapers, Registration, &c. of, [198] 559
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 199
Parliament—Reporters' Gallery, [198] 898
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [197] 868
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 12, [198] 772

Gray, Colonel W., *Bolton*
India — Rangoon and Western China, [195] 1356

Greaves, Mr. E., *Warwick*
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1778

Greece—British Payments to
Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 22, [194] 1896

Greene, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Coal Mines, Accidents in, [194] 312; [195] 359
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1734
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 428
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1994; Comm. [195] 891; *cl.* 2, 1043; *cl.* 39, [196] 275, 277
Murphy, Mr., the Protestant Lecturer, [197] 124;—Arrest of, 411
Parliament — Dublin City Writ, Motion for Adjournment, [196] 1793
Ways and Means, Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 791

Greenwich Hospital Bill
(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Childers, Mr. Adam*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *April* 27, [195] 1701; Bill ordered, after short debate
Read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 105]
Read 2° * *June* 11
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 24, [197] 553
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Liddell*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 124, N. 43; M. 81; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to; Committee; Report
Read 3° * *June* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Camperdown*) *July* 1
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 16, [198] 1; Bill read 2ª (No. 165)
Committee *; Report *July* 19 (No. 202)
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 44]

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 606
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 154; Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [196] 1214, 1215; *cl.* 7, 1217; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 1403; *cl.* 54, 1595; *cl.* 59, 1601; *cl.* 126, 1901; *cl.* 130, [197] 316; *cl.* 131, 415; *add. cl.* 416, 417, 420
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 681; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1271; *cl.* 34, Amendt. 1294; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1528; *cl.* 67, Amendt. 1539
[*cont.*

Gregory, Mr. G. B.—*cont.*
County Courts, 2R. [196] 685
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1239
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, [196] 1761; *cl.* 38, Amendt. 1780
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 426; *cl.* (D) 12, 579
India—Bank of Bengal, [196] 1237
Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal, Comm. [197] 1527
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1156, 1385; *cl.* 22, 1516; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1881, 1886; Consid. [196] 769; [198] 74
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1848
Real Property, Res. [196] 596
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1028
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 400
Waterloo and Whitehall Railway, [195] 972

Gregory, Mr. W. H., *Galway Co.*
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1202, 1248, 1270, 1699
Ireland—Medical and Educational Charges, [194] 303
  Poor Law Commissioners, [194] 1466
  Salmon Passes on the Shannon, [197] 651
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1694; Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1485; *cl.* 25, 1602, 1608; *cl.* 29, 1932; *cl.* 59, [196] 399; Amendt. 419; Lords Amendts. [198] 46, 60
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 490
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1254, 1278, 1493
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1791
  Morning Sittings, [197] 1189
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 331
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1444
  Industrial Museums, Edinburgh, [197] 1212

Greville-Nugent, Colonel F. S., *Longford Co.*
Ireland—Wetherall, Sir E. R., Appointment of, [194] 744, 753, 754
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1273
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, [195] 1594; *cl.* 26, 1617, 1623, 1627; *cl.* 27, 1865; *cl.* 59, [196] 410

Grey, Earl
Appropriation of Property, Motion for a Return, [194] 691
Assessed Rates, 2R. [197] 1751, 1752
Bankruptcy, [194] 98
Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 479
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 17
China—Missionaries in, [194] 944
Education, Public, [194] 820
Government of India Act Amendment, Report, [196] 696
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 347; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1310, 1315; *cl.* 10, 1323, 1327, 1335; *cl.* 13, 1339; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1343, 1344; *cl.* 10, [195] 225; *cl.* 12, 228
[*cont.*

GREY, Earl—*cont.*
Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 381
Murders in, [194] 1625, 1634
State of, [195] 1963
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1794
197] Notice, 352 ; Comm. Preamble, Amendt. 689, 743 ; *cl.* 6, 753 ; *cl.* 12, 871 ; *cl.* 14, 915; *cl.* 28, 1025 ; *add. cl.* 1109 ; *cl.* 29, 1125, 1138, 1141 ; *cl.* 33, 1155 ; *cl.* 41, 1161 ; *cl.* 68, 1251, 1253 ; Report, 1493, 1509
198] Commons Amendts. 266, 316, 319, 429, 446
Life Peerages, Comm. Preamble, [196] 1192 ; *cl.* 1, 1203, 1204 ; Report, *add. cl.* 1389
Militia, 3R. [196] 86
Municipal Magistrates, Removal of, [196] 1092
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 611
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 961
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 1R. [195] 473, 475 ; 2R. 1679, 1691
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1168; Comm. 1542

GREY, Right Hon. Sir G., *Morpeth*
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 233
Dublin Freemen Disfranchisement, [198] 158
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1285
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 10, [195] 1104 ; *cl.* 27, 1871 ; Lords Amendts. [197] 1921
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1311
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, Amendt. [196] 1784, 1792 ; [197] 127, 130
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1498
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 681
Speaker, Election of a, [194] 4

GRIEVE, Mr. J. J., *Greenock*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 389
Post Office—Stornaway, [194] 1900
Scotland—Cumbrae Lights, [198] 799
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 427

GROSVENOR, Earl, *Chester City*
Cattle Plague (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1807
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 96, [197] 1761

GROSVENOR, Hon. Captain R. W., *Westminster*
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 545 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [196] 737
Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Pay of, [194] 205 ; Res. [196] 1621
Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 846
South Eastern Railway, [197] 355
"Writers" in the Customs, [197] 624

GUEST, Mr. A. E., *Poole*
Army Estimates—Martial Law, [195] 662
Metropolis — Thames Embankment, South Side, [195] 1464
Supply—Royal Parks, &c., Amendt. [197] 658, 660

GURNEY, Right Hon. Russell, *Southampton*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 59, [196] 1600 ; *cl.* 127, 1906 ; *cl.* 130, [197] 320, 328
Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 869, 870 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 873 ; Consid. *cl.* 6, [197] 553
Clerks to Magistrates, [196] 1238
Coventry Election, [197] 995
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 6, [198] 1277 ; *cl.* 9, 1278 ; *cl.* 10, 1279 ; *cl.* 11, 1280 ; *cl.* 13, 1281
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 429 ; *cl.* 5, 577
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 717
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1223
Married Women's Property, Leave, [194] 331 ; 2R. [195] 760
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 930
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1589
Telegraph, Consid. *cl.* 24, Amendt. [198] 977

Habitual Criminals Bill
(*The Earl of Kimberley*)
194] *l.* Notice *Feb* 23, 199
. Bill presented ; read 1ª, after short debate *Feb* 26, 332 (No. 18)
. Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 5, 691
. Committee *Mar* 15, 1309 (No. 32)
195] Report, after debate *April* 6, 222 (No. 41)
Read 3ª * *April* 8
c. Read 1° * *April* 12 [Bill 73]
Read 2° * *July* 26
198] Committee—R.P. *August* 4, 1273
. Committee ; Report *August* 5, 1368 [Bill 264]
Considered * *August* 6
Read 3° * *August* 6
. *l.* Commons Amendts. *August* 9, 1469 ; after short debate, Commons Amendts. agreed to
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 99]

Hackney and Stage Carriages Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 20 [Bill 227]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee * ; Report *July* 31
Considered * *August* 2
Read 3° * *August* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *August* 4 (No. 266)
Read 2ª * *August* 5
Committee * *August* 6
Report * *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 115]

HADFIELD, Mr. G., *Sheffield*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 527
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1306, 1313
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1128
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 874
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 117
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1273
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 762
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 116 ; Lords Amendts. [198] 44

[*cont.*

HADFIELD, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1493
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 584
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 88
  Easter Recess, [194] 955
Parliament — Private Bills — Railway Bills, Res. [194] 105
Post Office—American Mail Contracts, [194] 717
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 967
Revision of the Statutes, [194] 1653; Res. [196] 1244
Trades Unions, Funds of, [194] 112

HALIFAX, Viscount
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations, 2R. [195] 1820
Government of India Act Amendment, 1R. [195] 1083; 2R. 1843; Report, [196] 693
India—Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 536
Ireland—Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1091
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 28, [197] 1044; Commons Amendts. [198] 275, 276, 430
Life Peerages, Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 1197
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Report, [196] 1286

HAMBRO, Mr. C. J. T., *Weymouth, &c.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 847
Velocipedes and Post Office Service, [196] 745

HAMILTON, Marquess of, *Donegal Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 44, Amendt. [196] 349

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord C., *Tyrone Co.*
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 573
Ireland—Lunatics, [198] 683
  Sligo Election, [195] 973
  State of, [195] 2003, 2008, 2013
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1973; Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1116; *cl.* 15, 1403; *cl.* 26, 1628; *cl.* 29, 1930; *cl.* 30, [196] 22; *cl.* 39, 318, 347; *cl.* 59, 416, 417; *add. cl.* 423
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 498
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 554
Murphy, Mr. Arrest of, Res. [198] 621
Parliament—Business of the House, Morning Sittings, Res. [195] 1975
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1501, 1510
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 671
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 336
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 805
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1444

HAMILTON, Lord G. F., *Middlesex*
Army Estimates—Military Stores, [195] 668
Hounslow, Explosion at, [197] 1169
Ireland—Londonderry, Riots in, [196] 390
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2054; Comm. *cl.* 36, [196] 70
Kew Gardens, [197] 124
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 553

HAMILTON, Mr. E. W. T., *Salisbury*
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1124
India—Accounts, [195] 1578
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [196] 1159

Harbour of Galle Loan Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 29
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 30 [Bill 250]
Read 2°* *August* 2
Committee*; Report *August* 3
Read 3°* *August* 4
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 5 (No. 268)
Read 2ª* *August* 6
Committee*; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 105]

Harbours of Refuge—Commission of 1859
Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer Mr. Bright *Feb* 23, [194] 200

HARCOURT, Mr. W. Vernon, *Oxford City*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [197] 360, 379, 384, 392; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 519, 520, 528; *cl.* 5, 532; *add. cl.* 534, 535; Consid. *add. cl.* 1083
Election Petitions, Judgments on, [194] 408, 759
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1812
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1373, 1384; *cl.* 15, 1394, 1400; *cl.* 29, 1895; Lords Amendts. [197] 1984
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 198
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [197] 130
Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 289
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 970; [197] 1887
Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 212
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 623

HARDCASTLE, Mr. J. A., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Emigration Commission, [195] 579
Navy—"Will-of-the-Wisp" Journal, [194] 208
Parliament—Easter Recess, [194] 157
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1491, 1496
Post Office — North German Confederation, [195] 1584

HARDINGE, Viscount
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1077
Militia, Comm. [195] 1843
National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 664

HARDWICKE, Earl of
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 28, [197] 1052
Naval Stores, 2R. [195] 673
Navy—Armament of Turret Ships, [195] 350

Hardy, Right Hon. Gathorne, *Oxford University*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 861
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 318
Coventry Election, Motion for a Committee, [197] 1332
Criminal Law—Liberation of Sir E. C. Eardley, [195] 1202
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 581
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 116, 955 ; 2R. 1390
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1265 ; *cl.* 4, 1273 ; *cl.* 6, 1277 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1278
Ireland — Fenian Convicts, Pardon of, [194] 161
Fereal, Union of, [196] 1205
State of, [195] 2049
Ireland—Dublin Election, [194] 1542 ; Motion for a Commission, [195] 1272, 1277, 1281, 1283
194] * Irish Church, 2R. 2066, 2088, 2111
195] Comm. *cl.* 3, 1099, 1100 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1100, 1104, 1105 ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1109, 1111 ; *cl.* 13, 1135 ; Amendt. 1136 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1137, 1156 ; *cl.* 17, 1411 ; *cl.* 20, 1501 ; *cl.* 22, 1511 ; *cl.* 25, 1599, 1604, 1605 ; Amendt. 1613, 1614, 1617 ; *cl.* 27, 1647 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1922, 1927
196] *cl.* 59, 403 ; Consid. 765
197] Lords Amendts. 1941, 1946, 1948, 1949, 1961, 1977, 1978 ; [198] 111
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 1535 ; 2R. [196] 963, 1351
Norwich Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 14
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 237
Parliament — Business of the House, [194] 1093
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 659
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 1102 ; *cl.* 24, Motion for reporting Progress, 1243
Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 179
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1544, 1545
Shrievalties of Yorkshire and Lancashire, [194] 411
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1451, 1452 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [197] 790 ; *cl.* 6, 794

Hardy, Mr. J., *Warwickshire, S.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1484 ; *cl.* 59, [196] 419

Hardy, Mr. J. Stewart, *Rye*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1873
Navy—Coastguard, [194] 628
Undue Influence and Bribery, [196] 1497

Harrowby, Earl of
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 15
Ecclesiastical Courts, 2R. [195] 838
Education, Public, [194] 822
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 619 ; Comm. *cl.* 15, 1881 ; *cl.* 30, 1884
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 349 ; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1336 ; *cl.* 12, [195] 229
Ireland —State of, [195] 1966

cont.

Harrowby, Earl of—*cont.*
Irish Church, 2R. Amendt. [196] 1666 ; Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 911 ; *cl.* 41, 1162 ; Report, 1491, 1495, 1521 ; 3R. 1644 ; Commons Amendts. [198] 432
Life Peerages, Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 1199 ; Report, 1390
Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 986

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of (Postmaster General), *New Radnor*
Electric Telegraphs, [194] 1788 ; [195] 845 ; Comm. [197] 1214, 1225
Post Office—Questions, &c.
Book Post, &c. [194] 1895
Communication with South Wales, [195] 1582
Life Assurances, [194] 1188
Mails to the United States, [194] 1464, 1465
Money Orders, [196] 14
Newspapers, Postage on, [194] 1188
New York Mails, [195] 1583
North German Confederation, [195] 1585
Services in Wales, [196] 1295
Stornoway, [194] 1901
Submarine Telegraph Cables, [198] 154
Velocipedes and Post Office Service, [196] 745
West India Mails, [195] 575, 842 ; [196] 15
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 246
Post Office—Mail Contracts, [194] 716, 717 ; Motion for a Committee, 1287 ; Res. [196] 1148, 1159
Post Office—Packet and Telegraph Contracts, Res. [197] 1818
Supply—Post Office, [198] 1000, 1001
Telegraph, Comm. [198] 759 ; *cl.* 3, 765 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 5, 771 ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 771, 772 ; *cl.* 20, 772 ; *cl.* 24, *ib.* ; Consid. 976, 977, 978

Hatherley, Lord (see **Chancellor**, The Lord)

Hay, Lord J. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Ripon*
Navy Estimates—Victualling Yards, &c. [195] 182

Hay, Rear-Admiral Sir J. C. D., *Stamford*
Agricultural Labour Commission, [194] 484
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1173
Army—Fortifications, &c. [196] 1572
Canada—Reduction of Forces, [196] 747
Cuba—Capture of an American Ship in British Colonial Waters, [196] 105
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 231
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. Amendt. [197] 563
Ireland—Inflammatory Speeches, [194] 1349, 1351
"Marquess of Abercorn," Loss of the, [196] 1897
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 361 ; Motion for Adjournment, 362
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1513

[*cont.*

HAY, Rear-Admiral Sir J. C. D.—*cont.*
Navy—Questions, &c.
Admiralty Contractors, [198] 897, 898
Flying Squadron, The, [197] 309
Fresh Water for the Fleet, [198] 892
"Inconstant," The, [196] 262
Naval Contracts, [198] 640
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 91, 94
Half Pay, [195] 216
Men and Boys, [194] 896
New Works, [195] 212
Salaries, [195] 73, 82
Victualling Yards, &c. [195] 184
Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 194
Rule of the Road at Sea, [194] 369; [195] 1465
Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [194] 1656; [195] 985
Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1473
Greenwich Hospital, [196] 1577
Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 801

Hayti, Civil War in
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Otway *Mar* 8, [194] 837

HEADLAM, Right Hon. T. E., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Army—Military Labour, Res. [195] 657
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1312
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Leave, [194] 92; 2R. Amendt. 1018
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 679; 2R. [195] 444; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1271, 1277, 1291
Light Dues, Res. [196] 149, 183
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [195] 1978
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 258, 304, 1467
Parliament—Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Res. [197] 962
Sheep and Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [194] 154
Spain—"Mermaid," Case of the, [194] 1659
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1437
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 789

HENDERSON, Mr. J., *Durham* (*City*)
Army—Retirement of Officers, [195] 1095
Durham County Courts, [195] 976
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 789

HENLEY, Lord, *Northampton Bo.*
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 504
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1326; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 393; *cl.* 4, 531
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 116

HENLEY, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
Agricultural Labourers, Res, [197] 604
Assessed Rates, [195] 842; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 378, 379; Consid. 1087, 1088
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1413; *cl.* 130, [197] 316

[*cont.*

HENLEY, Right Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [195] 1768
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [198] 1126
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 875
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1811
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 681; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1288; *cl.* 54, 1528; *cl.* 67, 1538, 1539; *cl.* 101, 1764
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1570
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1266
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 830; *cl.* 5, 844; *cl.* 8, 845; *cl.* 18, 846, 848; *cl.* 19, 852; *cl.* 24, 853; *cl.* 26, 854; *cl.* 36, 855
Dublin Freemen Commission, Leave, [197] 960; 2R. 1183
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1249
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 161
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1745, 1748; *cl.* (A) 12, 1762; *cl.* 15, 1767; Amendt. 1768; *cl.* 19, 1770, 1771; *cl.* 29, 1773, 1777; *cl.* 38, 1780; *cl.* 41, *ib.*, 1782
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1270; *cl.* 4, 1274; *cl.* 6, 1276; *cl.* 7, 1277; *cl.* 11, 1280
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 425, 430; *cl.* 5, 577; *cl.* (D) 12, 579; *cl.* 18, 581
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1168
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 20, [195] 1499; *cl.* 39, [196] 133, 134, 136, 139, 288; Consid. 765
Light Dues, Res. [196] 182
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Instruction, [197] 469; Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 365
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 790
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1515
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1131
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 630
Navy—Naval Contracts, [198] 650
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 228
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [197] 126
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1382; *cl.* 44, 1391, 1393; Consid. 1452, 1456, 1459
Railway Companies, Liabilities of, [198] 1439
Railway Guards and Passengers Communication, [198] 1439
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 969; 2R. [197] 1859
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1591
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1027
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1927
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 401
Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 466
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [197] 669
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 4, [198] 770
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1386
University Tests, Comm. [197] 772
Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 219
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), 2R. [195] 17
Ways and Means, Res. 1 (Corn, &c.), [195] 613; Res. 2 (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 791, 798, 799
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 627

HENNIKER-MAJOR, Hon. J. M., *Suffolk, E.*
  Cattle Disease—Importation of Diseased Sheep, [195] 1697
  County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 619
  Gladstone, Mr., and the Independent Orange Association, [197] 1890
  Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 250

HENRY, Mr. J. S., *Lancashire, S. E.*
  Ireland—Mayor of Cork, [194] 1999

HERBERT, Right Hon. Major-General Percy E., *Shropshire, S.*
  Army—Adjutancies of Militia, [197] 140
    Japan, Officers in, [198] 903
    Militia, [195] 667
  Army — Camping System, Major M'Gwire's, Motion for Papers, [198] 724
  Army—Military Labour, Res. [195] 658
  Army Estimates—Army Administration, [197] 147
    Land Forces, [194] 1168
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1385
  Militia, 3R. [195] 1532
  Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 797; Amendt. 799

HERBERT, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
  Ireland—Ballyheigue, Affray at, [196] 1207
    Tralee Gaol, [196] 1630
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1114; *cl.* 18, 1415; *cl.* 32, Amendt. [196] 23; *cl.* 39, 279; Lords Amendts. [198] 63
  Metropolitan Railway — Palace Yard Station, [194] 1898
  Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, [197] 120, 121; Res. 1582, 1588; [198] 20

Heritable Rights Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 204]
  Read 2° * *July* 15
  Committee *; Report *July* 22 [Bill 234]
  Bill withdrawn * *August* 2

HERMON, Mr. E., *Preston*
  Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 790; Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1415; *cl.* 91, Amendt. 1898; *cl.* 126, 1901
  Board of Trade Returns, [198] 705
  Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 774
  Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1252
  Preston Railway Station, [196] 1494
  Supply—Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1465
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 421; Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), [195] 593

HEYGATE, Sir F. W., *Londonderry Co.*
  Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 565
  Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. Amendt. [197] 1174

[*cont.*

HEYGATE, Sir F. W.—*cont.*
  Ireland—Questions, &c.
    Agrarian Crimes, [198] 839
    Education—Salaries of Teachers, [195] 1698
    Fenian Convicts, [194] 311
    Irish Church Funds, Surplus of, [198] 155
    Londonderry, Riots in, [195] 1848; [196] 749
    Polling Places, [194] 835
  Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 725
  Irish Church, Leave, [194] 469; 2R. 1825; Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1119; *cl.* 14, 1148, 1357; *cl.* 26, 1619; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1927; *cl.* 32, [196] 33; *cl.* 36, 69; *cl.* 39, 286; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 410, 412, 419; *add. cl.* 425; Consid. 769, 770; 3R. 971, 1002; Lords Amendts. [197] 1982; [198] 30, 577
  Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [197] 476
  O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 195
  Parliament—Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Res. [197] 963
  Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1555
  Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [195] 360
  Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1928
  Supply—Education, Public, [198] 737

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
  Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1310, 1321; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 383, 393, 397
  Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 54, [196] 1596; *cl.* 59, 1599; *cl.* 130, [197] 327; *add. cl.* 418
  Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [195] 1781
  Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 867
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 67, [197] 1539; *cl.* 101, 1763; *cl.* 7, 1768
  County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 616
  Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 574
  Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1774
  Gibraltar Convict Prison, [194] 952
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 53; *cl.* 59, 420
  Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 805
  Public Houses, &c. Res. [197] 458
  Representation of the People Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 512
  Savings Banks, [195] 1582
  Supply—Embassy Houses Abroad, Amendt. [197] 1466, 1468
    Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1481
    Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1444
    Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1462
  Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 795; Amendt. 800

High Constables Office Abolition, &c. Bill (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Staveley Hill*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 10 [Bill 160]
  Read 2° * *June* 18
  Committee *; Report *June* 28 [Bill 182]
  Re-comm. *; Report *July* 5 [Bill 195]
  Considered * *July* 7
  Read 3° * *July* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *July* 9 (No. 99)
  Read 2ª * *July* 22
  Committee *; Report *July* 23
  Read 3ª * *July* 27
  Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 47]

HILL, Mr. A. Staveley, *Coventry*
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 164; Comm. *cl.* 7, [196] 1218; *cl.* 46, 1411; *cl.* 47, 1416
County Courts, 2R. [196] 687
Diplomatic Pensions, [196] 1589
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1405
Evidence Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [195] 1805
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 329
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 174
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1281
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1038
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 744
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 779
Parliament—Drogheda Writ, [194] 797
  Dublin City Writ, [197] 133
  Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2070
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 985
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1545
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 772

HOARE, Sir H. A., *Chelsea*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry, Amendt. [196] 1575
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 376
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1734
Horses, Tax on, [195] 1097
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1797
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 574
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1116; *cl.* 39, [196] 348
Metropolis—St. James' Park, [194] 410
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1133
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1953
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1854
Representation of Minorities, [197] 124
Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 797

HODGSON, Mr. W. N., *Cumberland, E.*
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 745

HOLMS, Mr. J., *Hackney*
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1313; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 377; Consid. 1084
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Comm. *add. cl.* [198] 1059

HOLT, Mr. J. M., *Lancashire, N.E.*
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 879; *cl.* 12, 1123; 3R. Amendt. [196] 971
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 610, 628

HOPE, Mr. A. J. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1305; *cl.* 2, 1319; *cl.* 11, 1324
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1231
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 120; 2R. 1382; Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1744, 1747; *cl.* (A) 12, 1761; *cl.* 15, 1765, 1768; *cl.* 29, 1776; *cl.* 35, 1779; *cl.* 41, 1781

[*cont.*

HOPE, Mr. A. J. Beresford—*cont.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 15, [195] 1390; *cl.* 19, 1491; *cl.* 22, 1509; *cl.* 25, 1616; Consid. [196] 777; Lords Amendts. [197] 1980
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1306; Comm. Instruction, Motion for Adjournment, [197] 467, 470; *cl.* 1, [198] 358; Motion for reporting Progress, 364
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 784; 3R. [198] 404
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [194] 145
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 236
Parliament—Public Business—Orders of the Day, [198] 1092
  Rules of Debate, [194] 1468
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 275
Parliament — Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Res. [197] 964
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, Res. [197] 1584
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [198] 1444
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 958; 2R. Amendt. [197] 1831
Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [197] 1209
  Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1437
  Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1054; Motion for Adjournment, 1450, 1451; Comm. [197] 776

HOSKYNS, Mr. C. W., *Hereford City*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 833
Army—Ordnance Survey, [197] 946

Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption Bill
(*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Herbert Croft*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 14 [Bill 81]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 28, [195] 1814; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *July* 28

HOUGHTON, Lord
Government of India Act Amendment, 3R. [196] 1236
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1075
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 346; 2R. 708; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1313; *cl.* 10, 1321, 1323
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 13, [197] 879; *cl.* 35, 1157; *cl.* 68, 1258; 3R. 1633
Life Peerages, Report, [196] 1379
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 943, 955, 970
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 79
Wiltes Peerage, Report, [196] 428

Hounslow Powder Mills, Explosion at
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 24, [197] 515; Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 5, 1169

House Tax
Moved, "That the House Tax ought to be abolished because it imposes injurious and unnecessary restrictions upon the erection of dwellings for the Working Classes, and because the Tax presses very unequally upon

[*cont.*

House Tax—cont.
different classes of the community, and falls most heavily upon persons of moderate income" (*Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence*) *July* 13, [197] 1802 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Howard, Hon. C. G. W., *Cumberland, E.*
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 728, 752

Howard, Mr. J., *Bedford*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 446 ; Comm. *cl.* 54, [197] 1528 ; *cl.* 60, 1530 ; *cl.* 63, 1534
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1388 ; Comm. *cl.* 11, [196] 1751 ; *cl.* (A) 12, 1762 ; *cl.* 19, 1770
Patent Laws, [194] 356 ; [196] 909
Pollution of Rivers, [194] 202

Howes, Mr. E., *Norfolk, S.E.*
Norfolk Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 16
Ways and Means—Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), Amendt. [196] 803, 804

Hudson's Bay Company—Cession of Territory
Question, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Feb* 25, [194] 309 ; Question, Lord Cairns ; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 8, 798 ; Question, Viscount Bury ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 12, [195] 583 ; Question, Mr. Adderley ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 13, 680 ; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *June* 10, [196] 1497 ; Question, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 9, [197] 1526

Hughes, Mr. T., *Frome*
Army—Whitworth Gun, [194] 1660
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1556
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1416 ; *cl.* 130, [197] 317
Inclosure of Lands, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [195] 554
Natal—Green, Rev. Mr., Case of, [196] 467
Sunday Trading, 2R. [194] 557 ; Comm. [195] 799, 800, 802 ; *cl.* 1, [196] 1490
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1344

Hunt, Right Hon. G. W., *Northamptonshire, N.*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 325, 327, 328, 329
Canada—Railway Loan, Res. [197] 1448, 1454
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 873, 874 ; Amendt. 875 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 876
Clerks of Local Commissioners of Taxes, [196] 1207
Consolidated Fund (£17,100,000), 2R. [195] 1647
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1287, 1288 ; Amendt. 1289
County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 614
Courts of Justice, New, [195] 1700
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [196] 585 ; Comm. 812, 818 ; *cl.* 18, 849, 850
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [197] 1223
[*cont.*

Hunt, Right Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 41, [196] 1782
Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866, [197] 1190
Ireland—Incumbered Estates Court—Earl of Lanesborough's Estate, [195] 521
Irish Church, Leave, [194] 469 ; Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1478, 1485 ; *cl.* 27, 1864 ; *cl.* 32, [196] 28 ; *cl.* 39, 282
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 269
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 333
Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 846, 847
Dublin City Writ, [196] 1786 ; [197] 129
Parliament — Decoration of Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 718
Parliament — Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 196
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 282
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 250
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1298, 1305, 1306, 1307 ; Res. [196] 1155
Prosecutions, Cost of, [196] 811
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1277
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1935
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 646
Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 524, 532, 535
Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1436, 1441, 1442, 1444
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 508, 510, 514
New Law Courts, [196] 1577
Report, [198] 516
Stationery Office, [197] 1700
Works, &c. [197] 1707
Telegraph and Railway Companies, [196] 1299
Telegraph, Comm. [198] 756; *cl.* 4, 766
Treasury Board, Constitution of the, [194] 853
Vagrancy, [195] 1096
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 400, 413, 414, 433 ; Res. 1, (Corn, &c.), 591, 595, 597, 599, 601, 602, 627 ; Res. 2, (Customs and Excise Duties), Amendt. [196] 782, 794, 795, 797, 799 ; Amendt. 803, 805, 806, 807

Hutt, Right Hon. Sir W., *Gateshead*
Navy — Slave Trade, West Coast of Africa, [194] 831

Hylton, Lord
Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 695 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1312

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. Craufurd*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Carnegie*) *Feb* 18, [194] 112 ; Bill ordered, after short debate ; read 1° * [Bill 4]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 5, [196] 244
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "pending the consideration (by a Committee of the House of Lords) of the whole question of the Law of Hypothec as existing
[*cont.*

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill—cont.
both in Scotland and other countries, it is expedient to delay the further consideration of this Bill" (*Lord Elcho*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate [5th May] resumed *July* 21, [198] 368; after debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question put; A. 127, N. 91; M. 36; Bill read 2°

Imperial Gas Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *April* 28, [195] 1782
Amendt. to leave out "now taken into Consideration," and add "re-committed to the former Committee, with a view to the insertion of Clauses to make the Bill consistent with the provisions of 'The City of London Gas Act, 1868'" (*Mr. Morrison*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Amendt. to leave out "now taken into Consideration," and add "re-committed to the former Committee, with an Instruction to consider the expediency of inserting Clauses to make the Bill consistent with the provisions of 'The City of London Gas Act, 1868'" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after further short debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Imprisonment for Debt
Arrest of a Young Girl, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 18, [194] 111; *Feb* 23, 209
Case of John Kenn, aged 85, Questions, Observations, Mr. Collins; Reply, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 5, [194] 768

Imprisonment for Debt Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 19 [Bill 61]
Bill read 2°, after short debate *April* 5, [195] 173
Committee*; Report *April* 26 [Bill 98]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 18
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 22, [197] 421
Committee; Report *June* 25, 572 [Bill 179]
Considered *June* 29, 760
Read 3°* *July* 1
Lords Amendts. [Bill 252]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 2
Read 2ª* *July* 8 (No. 168)
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read, and discharged; and Bill referred to the Select Committee on the Bankruptcy Bill *July* 16, [198] 18
Committee *July* 26, 681
Report* *July* 27 (No. 224)
Read 3ª* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 62]

Inam Lands Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 22 (No. 143)
Read 2ª* *June* 24
Committee*; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª* *June* 28
c. Read 1°* *July* 1 [Bill 193]
Read 2°* *July* 2
Committee*; Report *July* 6
Read 3°* *July* 7
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 29]

Inclosure Awards (County Palatine of Durham) Bill—*Afterwards*
Cursitor (County Palatine of Durham) Bill (*Mr. Bentinck, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. William Lowther*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 10 [Bill 44]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 19, [194] 1894
Committee*; Report *July* 12 [Bill 210]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 28
Considered* *July* 29
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 3
Read 2ª* *August* 5 (No. 263)
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª* *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 84]

Inclosure of Lands Bill (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 1 [Bill 31]
Read 2°* *Mar* 5
Question, Mr. T. Chambers; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 22, [194] 1905
Committee*; Report *Mar* 22
Considered* *Mar* 23
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *April* 9, [195] 547
Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed, in order that from the proposed Inclosures some land may be reserved as allotments for the labouring poor, in accordance with the provision of the Act 8 & 9 Vic. c. 118, sections 30 to 34" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Debate adjourned
Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 13, 679
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether the Inclosure Act 8 and 9 Vic. c. 118, requires amendment" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *April* 20, 1286
Amendt. to add the words "in respect to the provisions for places of public recreation, and for allotments for the labouring poor" (*Mr. William Cowper*); after short debate, Question, "That those words, &c." put, and agreed to; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
And, on *April* 26, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. William Cowper (Chairman), Colonel Barttelot, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Thomas Chambers, Mr. Fawcett, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Andrew Johnston, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Knight, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Liddell, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. Pease, Mr. Peek, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. Philip Wykeham-Martin

[*cont.*

Inclosure of Lands Bill—cont.
Report of Select Committee *July* 7 (*Parl. P.* No. 304)
Committee * (*on re-comm*)—R.P. *July* 19
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *July* 30
Considered * *August* 3
Read 3° * *August* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 5 (No. 270)
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. clix.]

Inclosure of Lands (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 148]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 3

Income Tax
Moved, "That it is expedient to include in the Financial arrangements of the Government for the ensuing year the unconditional repeal of the Income Tax on trade profits and personal property of all kinds; and that any deficiency be raised by an increased tax on land and fixed property" (*Mr. Whalley*) *Mar* 16, [194] 1530; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Increase of the Episcopate Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Lyttelton*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 18 (No. 34)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 22, [195] 1329
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Lord Portman*); after debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 20, Not-Cont. 43; M. 23; resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1351

INDIA
Affghanistan, Ameer of, Question, Mr. Beckett Denison; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 9, [194] 955
Appeals, Question, Sir Charles Wingfield; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 8, [197] 1423

Army
Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 16, [194] 1462; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 26, [195] 1580 (*Parl. P.* No. 298)
Barracks at Morar, Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 8, [197] 1418
Colonels in India, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 15, [197] 1888
Indian Field Officers, Retirement of, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 1, [195] 1
Jhansi Prize Money, Question, Mr. T. Chambers; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 16, [194] 1466
Medal for Service in Umbeyla Campaign, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 28, [197] 624; *July* 8, 1424

[*cont.*

INDIA—cont.
Medal to Troops in Bhootan, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *August* 3, [198] 1144
Military Appointments — Official Memoranda, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 18, [194] 1655
Relief of Regiments in India, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Captain Vivian *July* 8, [197] 1421

Bank of Bengal, Bombay Branch, Question, Mr. Nicol; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 12, [194] 1186; Question, Mr. G. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 4, [196] 1237; Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answer, The Duke of Argyll *June* 24, [197] 513; Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *August* 5, [198] 1295
Report of Commission . . . . [4162]
Bhore Ghaut, Recent Accident at the, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 2, [194] 485
Ceylon—Little Basses Light, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre *July* 23, [198] 563

Education
Civil Service — Age of Native Candidates, Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 3, [196] 1208
Civil Service Examiners, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 8, [194] 841
Native Scholarships, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Feb* 25, [194] 310

Fisheries — Irrigation Works, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 21, [197] 357
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 315)
Government, Seat of, Removal of the, Question, Mr. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Feb* 25, [194] 312
Kohat, Garrison of, Surprize of the, Question, Mr. Wyllie; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 2, [194] 488
Muscat and Zanzibar, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 26, [195] 1580

Native Princes
Maharajah of Mysore—Guardianship of, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 10, [196] 1495
Nawab of Jungera, Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 6, [195] 231
Nawab of Tonk, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Feb* 25, [194] 310

Opium Cultivation, Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 22, [198] 449
Overland Routes to China, &c., Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 27, [198] 799; Question, Observations, Mr. Baines; Reply, Mr. Grant Duff; debate thereon *July* 30, 1032 — *Rangoon and Western China*, Question, Colonel Gray; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 22, [195] 1356 — *Red Sea Route to India*, Observations, Sir James Elphinstone; Reply, Mr. Childers *July* 26, [198] 706

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Punjaub Tenancy Act, Question, Sir Charles Wingfield; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Mar* 11, [194] 1085; *May* 13, [196] 748; Question, Mr. C. Denison; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 11, 1591; *August* 3, [198] 1145

Railway Extension, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *May* 13, [196] 744; *July* 8, [197] 1424
(*Parl. P.* [4190], 351, 412)

Railways—Eastern Bengal, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *July* 27, [198] 797

Railways (*India*)—*Financial Statement*, Correspondence with the Government of India respecting Railways (India) [No. 219]; also, Report on Railways (India) for the year 1868-9—Presented (by command) (*The Duke of Argyll*); long debate thereon *July* 23, [198] 521

Revenue and Finance

Auditor General of Accounts, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 21, [197] 357

Budget, The Indian, Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Feb* 23, [194] 201

East India (*Home Accounts*), Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *June* 17, [197] 118

Home Charges, Question, Mr. E. T. Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 26, [195] 1578

Moved, "That the Home Accounts of the Government of India [presented 10th May], be referred to the Committee of Public Accounts" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *July* 6, [197] 1329; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Finance—Bills drawn on India, Question, Mr. Mitchell; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 9, [195] 478

Revenues of India—Authority of the Secretary of State, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *May* 3, [196] 16
(See *East India Revenue Accounts*)

Parl. Papers—
Annual Accounts 205
Home Accounts 206

Telegraphic Communication, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *August* 9, [198] 1490
Convention—*Parl. P.* . . . . [4101]

India—Weights and Measures

Motion for Address for Copy of despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, of the 6th November 1868, relating to Weights and Measures for India [and other Papers] (*The Earl Fortescue*) *July* 27, [198] 795; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Industrial Schools (Great Britain) Bill [H.L.] (*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 20 (No. 64)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 7, [196] 357; after short debate, Bill withdrawn

Infant Life Preservation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 29 (No. 89)
Bill withdrawn *July* 13, [197] 1739

Insolvent Debtors Court, &c. Bill
Afterwards—
Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)

c. Bill ordered * *May* 11
Read 1º* *May* 28 [Bill 134]
Read 2º* *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 25 [Bill 180]
Re-comm.; Report *July* 9, [197] 1527
Considered * *July* 12
Read 3º* *July* 13
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 15
Read 2ª* *July* 29 (No. 195)
Committee * *July* 30 (No. 241)
Report * *August* 2
Read 3ª* *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 83]

Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal [*Re-payment of Unclaimed Dividends*]

Resolution reported *July* 9, [197] 1526; after short debate, Resolution agreed to

IRELAND

Ancient Monuments—Preservation of, Question, Mr. Agar-Ellis; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 19, [195] 1098

Area of Rating, Question, Mr. M'Mahon; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 18, [194] 111

Cardinal Cullen and the Privy Council of Ireland, Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 2, [194] 483

Church in Ireland—Union of Fercal, Question, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 3, [196] 1205
(See title *Irish Church Bill*)

Coronation Oath, Question, Observations, Lord Redesdale; Reply, Earl Granville *April* 19, [195] 1059; Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 29, [198] 893; Question, Observations, Mr. Charley; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 22, 906

Dublin and Belfast Waterworks Commission, Loans to, Question, Mr. W. Johnston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, [197] 125

Dublin City Election—(See that Title)

Dublin, Hackney Carriages in, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, [195] 583

Dublin—Lord Mayor of, Question, Mr. Wingfield Verner; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 13, [196] 746

Education

National Education—Report of Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Keown; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 22, [194] 1898

Salaries of Teachers under the National Board, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 27, [195] 1698

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Trinity College (Dublin), Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, those who are not members of the Established Church cannot be placed in a position of equality with regard to University Education in Ireland until all the Fellowships and Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, are freed from all religious disabilities" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *August* 3, [198] 1197; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Parl. Papers—
Thirty-fifth Report P. P. . . . [4193]
Science and Art Department . . [4103]
Schools, Monastic Institutions . . 194
Report for 1868-9 326

Election and Municipal Law

Election Petitions, Reports of the Judges, Question, Viscount St. Lawrence; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 19, [195] 1096 [*See the several Boroughs*]

Municipal Franchise, Question, Mr. M'Clure; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 12, [194] 1185

Polling Places, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 8, [194] 835

Registration (Ireland) Act—Clerks of Unions and Town Clerks, Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Mar* 8, [194] 839

Representation of Ireland—Re-distribution of Seats, Observations, Mr. Raikes, Mr. M'Mahon; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 26, [194] 357

Fisheries

Fisheries, Inspectors and Commissioners of, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 8, [194] 830; *Mar* 11, 1084; Question, Mr. Dodds; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 8, [195] 358; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *June* 25, [197] 571

Fishing Smacks, Seizure of, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Ayrton; short debate thereon *July* 1, [197] 948

Salmon Passes on the Shannon, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *May* 13, [196] 743; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *June* 28, [197] 648

Scotch and Irish Fisheries, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Childers *July* 29, [198] 893

Parl. Papers—
Report of Commissioners, 1868 . [4164]
Report of Inspectors, 1868 . . . [4177]
Papers 216
Correspondence 373

General Valuation, &c. (Ireland), Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the constitution and management of the department of the general Valuation of Ireland, the cost of the Townland and Tenement Valuation, and all matters connected with the annual revision thereof" (*Colonel French*) *Mar* 3, [194] 587

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

And, on April 5, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel French (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Ayrton, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Fitzwilliam Dick, Mr. M'Carthy Downing, Colonel Forde, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Colonel Greville, Mr. H. A. Herbert, Sir Frederick W. Heygate, Mr. Hunt, Mr. George H. Moore, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. Stacpoole, and Colonel Taylor

Report of Select Committee *July* 27 (*Parl. P.* No. 362)

Gladstone, Mr., and the Independent Orange Association, Question, Mr. Henniker-Major; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 15, [197] 1890

Government, Policy of the, Observations, Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Reply, Earl Granville; debate thereon *May* 7, [196] 357; Question, Observations, Earl Russell; Reply, Earl Granville; long debate thereon *May* 13, 707

Howth Harbour, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 1, [197] 947

Incumbered Estates Court — Earl of Lanesborough's Estate, Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland; short debate thereon *April* 9, [195] 518

Irish Militia, Training of the, Questions, Colonel French, Colonel Forde; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 19, [194] 125

Landlord and Tenant, Law of, Questions, Mr. Downing, Mr. Blake; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 26, [194] 353

Law and Police

Bankruptcy Law, Question, Mr. Fitzwilliam Dick; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 15, [194] 1355

Civil Bills, Law of, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 8, [194] 835

Clerk of the Crown for King's County, Questions, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 8, [197] 1421

Grand Jury Laws, Revision of, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 22, [194] 156

Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, Observations, Mr. Downing; Reply, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 9, [195] 497; *July* 7, [197] 1343

Licensing of Beerhouses, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 6, [195] 308

Prisons—County and Convict, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 29, [195] 1855

State of Ireland

State of Ireland, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Bath; Reply, Earl Granville; long debate thereon *April* 30, [195] 1954; Observations, Mr. Graves; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, 1982

Agrarian Outrages, Postponement of Question (*Viscount Lismore*); short debate thereon *April* 26, [195] 1533; Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

April 29, 1850; Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 28, [198] 839: Returns—(*P.P.* No. 266)

Assassinations in Ireland, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, Lord Dufferin; debate thereon *Mar* 18, [194] 1618; Question, Observations, Viscount Lifford; Reply, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *April* 30, [195] 1948

Anketell, Mr., Murder of, Question, Mr. Wingfield Verner; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 11, [194] 1091; Observations, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 18, [197] 351
(*Parl. P.* No. 215)

Ballycohey, The Murders at, Address for, Copies of the correspondence between the Irish Government and the stipendiary magistrate of Tipperary upon the aid to be given to the landlord of Ballycohey to enable him to serve certain notices upon his tenants, and upon the subsequent placing and the speedy withdrawal of extra police upon the townland of Ballycohey; [and other Returns] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 8, [194] 946; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ballyheigue—Affray at, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 3, [196] 1207

Dundalk and Louth, Proclamation of, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 12, [197] 1666

Protection of Life, Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 10, [196] 470

Rates on Disturbed Districts, Question, Colonel Wilson-Patten; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 3, [196] 20

Tarleton, Murder of Captain, Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 29, [195] 1849

Tipperary, Extra Police in, Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue May 13, [196] 744

Ulster, State of, Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Copies of Reports of the Stipendiary Magistrates relating to the state of Ulster on the 12th day of July 1869" (*Mr. William Johnston*) *July* 20, [198] 352; after short debate, Question put, and negatived—*In Caledon, on 12th of July*, Question, Mr. W. Verner; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 22, [198] 448

Fenian Conspiracy, The

Banquet at Cork—Speeches of the Mayor, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 18, [194] 1661; Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 23, 1997—*Mayor of Cork*, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 8, [195] 359
(See title—*O'Sullivan's Disability Bill*—
(*Municipal Magistrates, Removal of*)

Fenian Convict Mackey, Questions, Sir Thomas Bateson, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 9, [194] 953
[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Fenian Convict O'Donovan Rossa, Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 4, [196] 1238; Observations, Mr. G. H. Moore; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *August* 6, [198] 1422

Fenian Convicts in Australia, Released, Observations, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 23, [194] 209; Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 25, 311; Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 8, [195] 356

Fenian Prisoners—Released, Question, Notice withdrawn (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *April* 13, [195] 671

Fenian Convicts, Pardon of, Questions, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 22, [194] 159; Question, Colonel Annesley; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 18, 1659; *Mar* 22, 1904
Returns—(*Parl. P.* Nos. 72, 125)

Firearms, Use of, by the Irish Constabulary, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. C. Fortescue *July* 12, [197] 1668
General Instructions—*Parl. P.* No. 388

Limerick, Inflammatory Speeches at, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 15, [194] 1349; Question, Mr. Henry; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 23, 1999

Smith, Arrest of, a Fenian, Question, Colonel Annesley; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 18, [194] 1659; *Mar* 22, 1904

Londonderry, Riots in, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 29, [195] 1848—*Proclamation of the City*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Dowse; Answer, 196] Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 3, 20; Question, Mr. W. Johnston; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 4, 102; Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 4, 104; *May* 6, 263; Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 7, 390; Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 13, 749; Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 12, [197] 1667

Lord Lieutenant, Rumoured Resignation of the, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 23, [194] 2003

Lunatic Asylums—Report of Inspectors, Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 26, [198] 683
18th Report P. P. [4181]

Maynooth, College of, Returns, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 11, [194] 1091; Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 16, 1465; Observations, Mr. Newdegate; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Ayrton *April* 2, [195] 49; Questions, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Pemberton; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *April* 8, 360 — *Visitation*, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 13, 680

Returns—(*Parl. P.* Nos. 102, 117)
(See title *Irish Church Bill*)

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

Party Processions (Ireland) Act—The 12th July, Question, Sir John Gray ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 21, [197] 359 ; Question, Sir Thomas Bateson ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 5, 1172 ; Question, Mr. Downing ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue ; short debate thereon *July* 9, 1588

Police (Ireland), Observations, The Marquess of Clanricarde ; Reply, Lord Dufferin *July* 26, [198] 665

Poor Law—Medical and Educational Charges, Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Feb* 25, [194] 303 ; Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 16, 1466

Portadown, Riots at, Questions, Mr. W. Verner, Mr. Vance, Sir James Stronge ; Answers, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 5, [197] 1170 ; Question, Sir Thomas Bateson ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 12, 1665—*Inquest*, Observations, The Duke of Manchester ; Reply, Lord Dufferin *July* 13, 1737 ; *July* 19, [198] 123

Press Prosecutions—Case of Mr. O'Sullivan, Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the treatment of political prisoners, particularly of those who may be untried ; and of those who, under exceptional circumstances, may be detained in custody, without any special charge having been preferred against them" (*Mr. George Moore*) *June* 1, [196] 1160 ; after short debate, Question put, A. 20, N. 84 ; M. 64

Railways, Purchase of, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 26, [195] 1577
Second Report—*Parl. P.* . . [4086]

Religious Disturbances in Leitrim, Question, The Duke of Abercorn ; Answer, Earl Spencer *July* 6, [197] 1226

Roscommon and Galway Lunatic Asylum, Question, Colonel French ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 18, [197] 313

St. Patrick's Day in Dublin, Question, Mr. R. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 6, [195] 230

Seditious Language in the Queen's Colleges of Galway and Belfast, Question, Mr. Dawson ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 24, [197] 517

Stationery Office, Question, Mr. Bagwell ; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *May* 11, [196] 573

Tralee Gaol, Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answers, Mr. H. A. Herbert, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *June* 11, [196] 1629

Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—Appointment of Sir E. R. Wetherall, Question, Observations, Colonel Greville-Nugent ; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue ; short debate thereon *Mar* 5, [194] 744 ; Question, Observations, The Earl of Longford ; Reply, Earl Granville ; short debate thereon *June* 1, [196] 1085

Ireland—The Irish Society

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the manner in which the Irish Society administer the property which, according to their own admission in their law suit with the Skinners' Company, they hold as trustees for the benefit of their trust ; and to consider whether, under a totally different state of circumstances from those in which the Society had their origin, it would not be advisable to carry into effect the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1854 on the Corporation of London, that the Irish Society should be abolished ; and to advise such other arrangements as would be most in harmony with existing circumstances, and most conducive to the public advantage" (*Mr. Maguire*) *April* 13, [195] 680 ; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Irish Church Bill

LORDS—

Question, Observations, Lord Bateman ; Reply, Earl Granville ; short debate thereon *June* 11, [196] 1578

Appropriation of Property, Moved, That there be laid before this House, a Return of all Acts of Parliament whereby property belonging to any person, corporation, or trust has been taken from such person, corporation, or trust without their consent, and without securing to them full compensation for the property so taken, or without offence being charged against such person, corporation, trust or justifying such confiscation (*The Lord Redesdale*) *Mar* 5, [194] 684
Amendt. to leave out from ("consent") and insert ("together with the reasons stated in such Acts for the appropriation of such property") (*The Earl Granville*) ; after short debate, Amendt. and original Motion withdrawn

Bishops of Protestant Churches—Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Question, Lord Colchester ; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 7, [196] 1280 ; Question, Mr. MacEvoy ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 5, [197] 1169

Bright, Mr., Letter of, Notice, Lord Cairns *June* 15, [196] 1794 ; Question, Lord Cairns ; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 17, [197] 1

Coronation Oath, Question, Observations, Lord Redesdale ; Reply, Earl Granville *April* 19, [195] 1059 ; Question, Mr. White ; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 29, [198] 893 ; Question, Observations, Mr. Charley ; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 29, 906

Petitions from Archdeaconry of Exeter, Observations, The Earl of Devon *June* 7, [196] 1279 ; Observations, The Duke of Abercorn—*from Belfast June* 11, 1581

Tithe Rent-Charges (Ireland), Motion for, "Return of all the tithe rent-charges sold in the Encumbered and the Landed Estates Courts, Ireland, specifying in each case, 1. Date of Sale : 2. Amount of rent-charge : 3. Whence accruing : 4. Price for which sold : 5. How many times the amount of each rent-charge the price is equal to" (*The Earl of Limerick*) *Mar* 11, [194] 1081 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Motion for Returns (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *April* 9, [195] 450 ; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
(*Parl. P.* No. 47)

Irish Church Bill—cont.

COMMONS—

Church Property — Archbishop Bramhall's Fund, Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 16, [194] 1461

Borrowing Powers of Limited Owners, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 22, [195] 1357

Church Property—Ecclesiastical Residences—Private Endowments, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 15, [194] 1351

Church Property, Appropriation of— The Presbyterian Church—Maynooth, Question, Mr. Corrance; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 11, [194] 1087

Endowments, Amount of, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 8, [194] 839

Surplus of the Irish Church Funds—Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 19, [198] 155

Church of England—Prelates of the Irish Church—Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 6, [196] 261

Episcopal Clergy, Disability to sit in Parliament, Question, Lord Henry Thynne; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 23, [195] 1466

Disability of the Roman Catholic Clergy, Question, Mr. Dixon; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 13, [196] 746

Relation of the Irish Clergy to the Church of England, Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 20, [195] 1198

Church Leaseholds, Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 19, [195] 1096

Church Leases, Purchase of, in Perpetuity, Question, Dr. Ball; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *April* 19, [195] 1095

Impropriate Tithe Rent-Charge, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 30, [195] 1974

Bright, Mr., Letter of, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 17, [197] 121

Maynooth, College of, Question, Mr. Corrance; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 11, [194] 1087; Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 18, 1658

Maynooth, Professors of, Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 13, [196] 748

Organists, Question, Mr. O'Reilly-Dease; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 20, [195] 1197

State Aid to Irish Nonconformists, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *July* 19, [198] 153

Valentia — The Living of, Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 12, [194] 482

Irish Church Bill—Church Temporalities Commissioners

Names, Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 8, [195] 356

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.

Church Temporalities (Ireland) Commissioners [Advances], Considered in Committee *April* 23, [195] 1531; Resolved, That the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt be authorized to advance, with the consent of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, to the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland to be appointed by any Act passed in the present Session of Parliament "to put an end to the Establishment of the Church in Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect to the Royal College of Maynooth," such monies as the said Commissioners of Church Temporalities may require to raise for the purposes of the said Act; and that it is expedient to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to guarantee the repayment to the said Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt of any monies so advanced (*Mr. Gladstone*)

Resolution reported, and agreed to *April* 26

Irish Church Bill—*Formerly* Established Church (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

194] *c.* Acts 39 and 40 Geo. 3, c. 67, 3 and 4 Will. 4, c. 37, 1 and 2 Vic. c. 109, 35 Geo. 3, c. 21 (Ireland), 40 Geo. 3, c. 85 (Ireland), 8 and 9 Vic. c. 25, and Resolution [7th May 1868] relative to the Established Church (Ireland) read; considered in Committee *Mar* 1, 412

Bill ordered, after debate; read 1°* [Bill 27]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 18, 1662

Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Disraeli*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 19, 1791; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 22, 1906; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 23, 2004; after long debate, Question put; A. 368, N. 250; M. 118; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 2128

195] Notice of Amendments (*Mr. Disraeli*) *April* 12, 585

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *April* 15, 847

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Newdegate*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 355, N. 229; M. 126

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 936

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee; Committee—R.P.

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.
195] Committee *April* 16, 993
Clause 1 (Short Title)
Clause 2 (Dissolution of legislative union between Churches of England and Ireland); Committee—R.P.

. Committee *April* 19, 1099
Clause 3 (Appointment of commissioners)
. Clause 7 (Powers of commissioners), 1100
. Clause 10 (Prohibition of future appointments), 1100
. Clause 12 (Church property vested in commissioners under Act), 1109
. Clause 13 (Dissolution of ecclesiastical corporations, and cessation of right to sit in House of Lords), 1124
. Clause 14 (Compensation to ecclesiastical persons other than curates), 1137; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *April* 22, 1364
. Clause 14 (Compensation to ecclesiastical persons other than curates), 1364
. Clause 15 (Compensation to curates), 1386
. Clause 16 (Compensation to diocesan schoolmasters, clerks, and sextons), 1404
. Clause 17 (Compensation to organists, vergers, and others), 1410
. Clause 18 (Compensation to lay patrons), 1412; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *April* 23, 1473
. Clause 18 (Compensation to lay patrons), 1473
. Clause 19 (Repeal of laws prohibiting synods, &c.), 1488
. Clause 20 (Existing law to subsist by contract), 1495
. Clause 21 (Abolition of ecclesiastical courts and ecclesiastical law), 1506
. Clause 22 (Incorporation of church body), 1506
. Clause 23 (Redemption of annuities and life interest of ecclesiastical persons), 1518; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *April* 26, 1585
Clause 24 (Building charge to be paid on commutation of annuity)
. Clause 25 (Enactments with respect to churches), 1585
. Clause 26 (Enactments with respect to burial grounds), 1617
. Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences), 1629; Committee—R.P

. Committee *April* 29, 1856
Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences)
. Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1876
. Clause 28 (Power to convey additional land to church body), 1880
. Clause 29 (Enactments with respect to private endowments), 1881
. Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1923
Committee—R.P.

196] Committee *May* 3, 22
. Clause 30 (Enactments with respect to mixed endowments), 22
. Clause 31 (Limitations of right to purchase fee simple in consideration of perpetual rent), 23
. Clause 32 (Sale of tithe rent-charge to owners of land), 23

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.
196] Clause 33 (Power of Commissioners to sell their property), 53
. Clause 36 (Compensation to nonconforming ministers), 66
. Clause 37 (Compensation in respect of salaries of professors and college buildings at Belfast), 73
. Clause 38 agreed to, 76; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *May* 4, 107
. Clause 39 (Repeal of Maynooth Acts. Compensation on the cessation of certain annual sums), 107; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *May* 6, 265
. Clause 39 (Repeal of Maynooth Acts. Compensation on the cessation of certain annual sums), 265; A. 318, N. 192; M. 126
. Division List, Ayes and Noes, 298
. Clauses 40 to 42 agreed to, 349
. Clause 43 (Compensation to Ecclesiastical Commissioners and their officers), 349
. Clause 44 (Compensation to vicars general and other officers by annuities equal to their average income for the three years ending 1st January, 1870), 349
Clauses 45 to 48 agreed to
. Clause 49 (Regulations as to payment of annuity), 349
. Clauses 50 and 51 agreed to, 350
. Clause 52 (Sales of lands, &c., may be made in Landed Estates Court), 350
. Clauses 53 to 57 agreed to, 350
. Clause 58 (Regulation as to vacancies), 350; Committee—R.P

. Committee *May* 7, 390
. Clause 58 (Regulation as to vacancies), 390
. Clause 59 (Ultimate trust of surplus), 395
. Clause 60 agreed to, 420
. Clause 61 (Saving rights as to proprietary chapels and chapels of ease), 420
. Clause 62 (Saving of Act of 39 & 40 *Geo.* III. c. 67), 421
. Clause 63 (Interpretation) amended, and agreed to, 421
. Clause 3 (Appointment of commissioners), 421
. Clauses 4 to 9 agreed to, 423
. New Clause (Accounts of capital and revenues), 423
Bill reported *May* 7 [Bill 112]

. Considered as amended *May* 13, 751
. New Clause (Moveable chattels belonging to see or Church), 751
. New Clause (Provision for the officers of Cathedral Churches in Ireland), 751
. New Clause (Compensation to ecclesiastical persons not otherwise provided for), 757
. New Clause (Annuities not to be forfeited because annuitants do not consent to alteration in articles of Church), 758
. New Clause (Benefices of Saint Mary, Saint Thomas, and Saint George, Dublin), 766
. New Clause (Commissioners may purchase surrender or assignment of lease), 767
. New Clause (Compensation to trustees of Armagh Observatory), 767

Re-comm. *; Report *May* 28

Considered * *May* 28 [Bill 123]

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.
196] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^o" *May* 31, 971
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Holt*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put, A. 361, N. 247; M. 114
• Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1078
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3^o, and passed

l. Read 1^a* (*Earl Granville*) *June* 1 (No. 109)
. Moved, That the last three paragraphs of Her Majesty's most gracious Speech be read (*Earl Granville*)—agreed to; and the said paragraphs accordingly read by the clerk *June* 14, 1637
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a"
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Harrowby*); after long debate, Debate adjourned

. Adjourned Debate *June* 15, 1794; after long debate, further Debate adjourned

197] Adjourned Debate *June* 17, 18; after long debate, further Debate adjourned
. Adjourned Debate *June* 18, 162; after long debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 179, Not-Cont. 146; M. 33; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2^a
• Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 305
. Protest thereon (*The Earl of Clancarty*), 307

. *Notice of Amendments*, Observations, Earl Grey; Reply, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *June* 21, 352

. Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee upon the said Bill *June* 29, 686; after short debate, House in Committee
Title postponed
Then it was moved that the Preamble be postponed; which being objected to (*The Earl Grey*); resolved in the affirmative; Preamble postponed
. Clause 1 (Short title), 743
. Clause 2 (Dissolution of legislative union between churches of England and Ireland), 743
. Clause 3 (Appointment of commissioners), 753
. Clause 4 (Quorum of commissioners), 753
. Clause 5 (Appointment of officers), 753
. Clause 6 (Salaries and expenses), 753
. Clause 7 (Powers of commissioners), 755
. Clause 8 (Forms of application, and general rules), 759
. Clause 9 (Duration of office, and restriction on sitting in Parliament), 759
. Clause 10 (Prohibition of future appointments), 760

. Committee *July* 1, 869
. Clause 11 (Property of ecclesiastical commissioners vested in commissioners under Act), 869
. Clause 12 (Church property vested in commissioners under Act), 870
. Clause 13 (Dissolution of ecclesiastical corporations, and cessation of right to sit in House of Lords), 874
. Clause 14 (Compensation to ecclesiastical persons other than curates), 886

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.
197] Clause 15 (Compensation to curates), 918
. Clause 16 (Compensation to diocesan schoolmasters, clerks, and sextons), 921
Clause 17 (Compensation to organists, vergers, and others)
. Clause 18 (Compensation to lay patrons), 923
Clauses 19 to 22 [*Powers of Church after passing of Act*] postponed
. Clause 23 (Redemption of annuities and life interest of ecclesiastical persons), 924

. Committee *July* 2, 996
. Clause 24 (Building charge to be paid on commutation of annuity), 996
. Clause 25 (Enactments with respect to churches), 997
. Clause 26 (Enactments with respect to burial-grounds), 998
. Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences), 1000
. Clause 28 (Power to convey additional land to church body), 1024

. Committee *July* 5, 1108
. Clause 29 (Enactments with respect to private endowments), 1110
. Clause 30 (Enactments with respect to mixed endowments), 1154
. Clause 31 (Moveable chattels belonging to see or church), 1154
. Clause 32 (Limitation of right to purchase fee simple in consideration of perpetual rent), 1154
. Clause 33 (Sale of tithe rentcharge to owners of land), 1154
• Clause 34 (Commissioners may purchase surrender or assignment of lease), 1157
. Clause 35 (Power of commissioners to sell their property), 1157
. Clause 36 (Orders of commissioners operating as conveyance or mortgage to be liable to same stamp duty as conveyances or mortgages), 1158
. Clause 37 (Payment of money into bank), 1158
. Clause 38 (Accounts of capital and revenues), 1158
. Clause 39 (Compensation to nonconforming ministers), 1158
. Clause 40 (Commutation of annuities of nonconformist ministers and professors at Belfast), 1159
. Clause 41 (Repeal of Maynooth Acts. Compensation on the cessation of certain annual sums), 1159
. Clause 42 (Remission of debt to trustees of Maynooth), 1163
. Clause 43 (Regulations as to appeal), 1163
. Clause 44 (Possession to be given up of 24, Upper Merrion Street), 1163
. Clause 45 (Compensation to Ecclesiastical Commissioners and their officers), 1164
. Clause 46 (Compensation to vicars-general and other officers by annuities equal to their average income for the three years ending 1st January, 1869), 1164
. Clause 47 (Benefices of Kilcullen, Kildare, Saint Mary, Saint Thomas, and Saint George, Dublin), 1165
. Clause 48 (Delivery up of books by registrars), 1165
. Clauses 49 to 59 [*Dealings with Property*], 1165

[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.

197] Clauses 60 to 65 [*Power of the Commissioners to raise Money*], 1165
. Clause 66 (Rules as to arbitration), 1165
. Clause 67 (Regulation as to vacancies), 1165

. Committee *July* 6, 1228
. Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus), 1228
. Clause 69 (Provision as to Acts relating to United Church of England and Ireland), 1260
. Clause 70 (Saving rights as to proprietary chapels and chapels of ease), 1261
. Clause 71 (Saving of Act of 39 & 40 Geo. 3, c. 67), 1261
. Clause 72 (Interpretation), 1261
. Clause 19 (Repeal of laws prohibiting holding of synods, &c.), 1261
. Clause 20 (Existing law to subsist by contract), 1267
. Clause 21 (Abolition of ecclesiastical courts and ecclesiastical law), 1267
. Clause 22 (Incorporation of church body), 1268,
. Preamble, as amended, agreed to ; Title read, and agreed to, 1268
As amended in Committee (No. 172)

. Amendments reported *July* 9, 1484
. Clause 2 (Dissolution of legislative union between Churches of England and Ireland), 1489
. Clause 10 (Prohibition of future appointments), 1489
. Clause 12 (Church property vested in Commissioners under Act), 1490
. Clause 69 (Ultimate trust of surplus), 1490
. Clause 13 (Dissolution of ecclesiastical corporations, and cessation of right to sit in House of Lords), 1493
. Clause 14 (Compensation to ecclesiastical persons other than curates), 1500
. Clause 21 (Existing law to subsist by contract), 1502
. Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to burial grounds), 1503
. Clause 28 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences), 1504
. Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 1513
. Clause 30 (Enactments with respect to private endowments), 1517 ; after long debate, Amendments made
As amended on Report (No. 182)

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *July* 12, 1595
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Clancarty*) ; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; original Motion agreed to ; Bill read 3ª ; after further long debate, Amendments made
. Division Lists, Conts. and Not-Conts., 1623, 1657
On Question, That the Bill do pass ? objected to ; on Question, agreed to ; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons
Protests thereon—
. Against the Third Reading of the Bill, 1661
. Against the Passing of the Bill, 1662

.*c.* Lords Amendts. considered *July* 15, 1891 ; after long debate, further Consideration deferred [Bill 209]
[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.

198] Lords Amendts. further considered *July* 16, 21
Clause 29 (Enactments with respect to private endowments), 47
Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus), 94
After long debate, Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed"
Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendts. reported, and agreed to · to be communicated to the Lords

.*l.* Returned from the Commons with several of the amendments made by the Lords agreed to ; several amendments agreed to, with amendments ; and several other amendments disagreed to, for which they assign Reasons :—The said Reasons, and Bill, with the amendments, to be printed ; and to be taken into consideration on Tuesday next *July* 16
With Commons Amendts. and Reasons (Nos. 196 and 197)

Commons amendments to Lords amendments and Commons reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords considered *July* 20
. Moved, That this House do not insist on so much of the amendment made in the preamble, to which the Commons have disagreed, as consists in leaving out the words ("held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion") (*The Earl Granville*), 235
. After short debate, Amendt. to leave out from ("House") to the end of the motion and insert ("do insist on the amendment made to the preamble to which the Commons have disagreed") (*The Duke of Marlborough*), 289
. After further short debate, on Question, "That the words, &c. ;" Cont. 95, Not-Cont. 173 ; M. 78 ; resolved in the negative
Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 321
Further debate on Commons amendments and reasons adjourned

. Commons amendments to Lords Amendments and Commons reasons for disagreeing to some of the amendments made by the Lords, further considered *July* 22, 406
Moved, in Clause 2, not to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed (*The Earl Granville*)
After long debate, Motion, That the House do not insist upon the Amendment, agreed to
. Clause 27 (Enactments with respect to ecclesiastical residences), 442
Moved, Not to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed (*The Earl Granville*)
After short debate, on Question ? Cont. 47, Not.-Cont. 17 ; M. 30
. Division List, Cont. and Not.-Cont., 444
. Protest thereon, 445
. Clause 68 (Ultimate trust of surplus), 446
[*cont.*

Irish Church Bill—cont.
Then it was moved, "Not to insist on the Amendments in Clause 68, to which the Commons disagree, but to leave out the said clause, and to insert the following clause in lieu thereof:
"And whereas it is further expedient that the proceeds of the said property should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor: Be it further enacted, that the said proceeds shall be so applied accordingly in the manner Parliament shall hereafter direct"
After short debate, Motion agreed to; words inserted accordingly
A Committee appointed to prepare reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on the said amendments: The Committee to meet forthwith
Report read, and agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with amendments and reasons

c. Lords Amendments to Commons Amendments and Reasons [Bill 231]
Ordered, That the Commons Amendments to the Lords Amendments to the Irish Church Bill, and the Reasons for disagreeing to several of the Lords Amendments, be printed (*Mr. Walpole*) *July* 22, 520 [Bill 232]
Lords Amendments to Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments and Reasons considered *July* 23, 564
After debate, Amendments and Reasons read a second time, 577
Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon its disagreement to the Amendments insisted upon by the Lords; and doth agree to the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, and to the consequential Amendment to the said Bill
l. Returned from the Commons, with the amendments made by the Lords to the amendments made by the Commons to the amendments made by the Lords, and the consequential amendment, agreed to; and the amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons had disagreed and on which the Lords have insisted, agreed to *July* 23, 521
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 42]

Parl. Papers—
COMMONS—
Bill . . . . [Bill 27]
As amended in Committee . . [Bill 112]
As amended on Consid. . . . [Bill 123]
As amended by the Lords . . [Bill 209]
Lords Amendts. to Commons Amendts. and Reasons . . [Bill 231]
Commons Amendts. and Lords Amendts. and Reasons . . [Bill 232]
LORDS—
Bill as sent from Commons . . (No. 109)
As amended in Committee . . (No. 172)
As amended on Report . . . (No. 182)
With Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts. . . . . (No. 196)
Commons Amendts. and Reasons . . . . (No. 197

Italy—Arrest of Mr. Nathan
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 10, [198] 1526

Jamaica—Jamaica Clergy Act
Question, Mr. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Monsell *August* 11, [198] 1542

Jamaica Loans Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered * *July* 6
Read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 200]
Read 2° * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 16
Read 3° * *July* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *July* 20
Read 2ª * *July* 29 (No. 204)
Committee * *July* 30
Report * *August* 2
Read 3ª * *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 69]

JAMES, Mr. H., *Taunton*
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 950
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 426; Amendt. 428, 429
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1789

JENKINSON, Sir G. S., *Wiltshire, N.*
Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 634
Assessed Tax Papers, [198] 1250, 1251
Capital Punishment, [198] 995
Capital Sentences, Remission of, [195] 1358
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1040
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 449; Comm. *cl.* 96, [197] 1761; *add. cl.* 1772
County Courts, 2R. [196] 688
Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 560
Criminal Classes, The, [194] 147
Criminal Law—Convict George Roberts, [194] 161
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1273; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1275; *cl.* 10, 1279; *add. cl.* 1368, 1369
Imprisonment for Debt—Arrest of a young Girl, [194] 111, 209
Income and Assessed Taxes, Payment of, [197] 122
Ireland—Fenian Convicts, [194] 1997; [195] 356
Maynooth College, [194] 1658
194] Irish Church, 2R. 1704
195] Comm. 941; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1364, 1365, 1366; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1594, 1595, 1599, 1617; *cl.* 27, Motion for reporting Progress, 1644, 1866; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1880
196] *cl.* 39, Amendt. 139, 148, 296, 348
Local Taxation, [194] 534; [195] 358, 977
Malt Tax, [198] 1247
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 662
Poor Law, Res. [197] 444
Turnpikes, [198] 620
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 618

Jersey Jurats
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 1, [197] 945

Jervis, Colonel H. J. W., *Harwich*
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. Amendt. [196] 648

Jessel, Mr. G., *Dover*
194] Bankruptcy, Leave, 792
195] 2R. 142
196] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1212; *cl.* 6, 1215; *cl.* 7, 1217,
. 1218; *cl.* 8, 1219; *cl.* 14, 1221, 1223, 1224;
. *cl.* 43, 1403; *cl.* 46, 1408, 1416; *cl.* 59, 1602;
. *cl.* 91, 1607, 1898; *cl.* 126, 1905
197] *cl.* 130, 325; *cl.* 131, 416; *add. cl.* 417
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 427
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1225
Married Women's Property, 3R. [198] 404
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 340

Johnston, Mr. A., *Essex, S.*
Army—Ordnance Survey, [195] 1974
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 330
Cattle Disease, [197] 949
Corn Duty, [195] 844
Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol, [198] 1051
Metropolitan Board of Works, [195] 674
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Comm. *add. cl.* [198] 1060
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, Res. [197] 1583
Real Property, Res. [196] 600

Johnston, Mr. W., *Belfast*
Ireland—Loans for Dublin and Belfast, [197] 125
Londonderry, Riots in, [196] 102
Ireland—Ulster—Recent Events in, Motion for Papers, [198] 352
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 36, [196] 69; *cl.* 59, 402; 3R. 1039
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 240
Party Processions (Ireland), Leave, [194] 122; 2R. 1547; [197] 868
Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [195] 982
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1929

Johnstone, Sir H., *Scarborough*
Spain—Imprisonment of a British Subject at Barcelona, [196] 1741

Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Bill (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 31 [Bill 140]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Committee *, Report *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Lichfield*) *July* 1 (No. 167)
Bill withdrawn * *August* 3

Jones, Mr. J., *Carmarthenshire*
Post Office—Communication with South Wales, [195] 1582

Judicature Commission — Extension of Powers
Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 11, [196] 1633

Judicial Statistics (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 142]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *June* 25 (No. 151)
Read 2ª * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 16
Read 3ª * *July* 19
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 33]

Justices, &c., Clerks to—Fees and Salaries
Question, Mr. Russell Gurney; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 4, [196] 1238; Explanation, Mr. Bruce *June* 7, 1299

Justices of the Peace Qualification Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Albemarle*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 4 (No. 93)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 24 [197] 506
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Duke of Richmond*); after short debate, Amendt., original Motion, and Bill withdrawn

Kavanagh, Mr. A. M., *Carlow Co.*
Ireland—Beerhouses, Licensing of, [195] 308
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, [194] 484; 2R. [195] 322

Kekewich, Mr. S. T., *Devonshire, S.*
Catholic Children in Workhouses, [197] 1418, 1421
Supply—Poor Law Commission, [197] 1692
Woods, Rating of, [194] 411

Keown, Mr. W., *Downpatrick*
Ireland—Education, National, [194] 1898

Kew Gardens
Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 17, [197] 124

Kimberley, Earl of (Lord Privy Seal)
Assessed Rates, 2R. [197] 1750
Criminal Law—Repression of Crime, [194] 199
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [198] 1083; 3R. 1287
Election Commissioners (Expenses), 2R. [196] 1588
Fine Arts Copyright Consolidation and Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [195] 1943
194] Habitual Criminals, 1R. 332, 350; 2R. 712;
. Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1310; *cl.* 4, 1311,
. 1312, 1314, 1315, 1317; *cl.* 6, Amendt.
. 1319; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1320, 1321, 1328,
. 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1335; *cl.* 12,
. 1337, 1338; *cl.* 13, 1339; *cl.* 14, 1340,
. 1342, 1344; *cl.* 17, 1347

[*cont.*

Kimberley, Earl of—*cont.*
195] *cl.* 4, Amendt. 222; *cl.* 10, 224, 225; Amendt. 226; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 227; *cl.* 14, 229
198] Commons Amendts. 261, 262, 264, 1469
 Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 378
  Murders, [194] 1649
  State of, [195] 1964; [196] 724, 726
196] Irish Church, 2R. 1666
197] 41, 48; Comm. Preamble, 730; *cl.* 6, 753; *cl.* 13, 879; *cl.* 14, 891, 910; *cl.* 18, 924; *cl.* 23, 933; *cl.* 25, 998; *cl.* 26, 999, 1000; *cl.* 27, 1014; *cl.* 28, 1069; *add. cl.* 1110; *cl.* 29, 1142; *cl.* 46, 1164; *cl.* 68, 1249, 1253; *add. cl.* 1260; Report, 1489, 1501, 1503, 1504; 3R. 1638
 Municipal Franchise, Report, [198] 145
 Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 13
 Railway Companies Meetings, Comm. [195] 672
 Railways Abandonment, 2R. [198] 1139
 Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [198] 1077; Comm. 1283
 Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1179

King, Hon. P. J. Locke, *Surrey, E.*
 Army—Patriotic Fund Commission, [194] 1465; [195] 1583; [196] 469
 Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 329
 Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, Amendt. [195] 1627
 Parliament—Crypt of St. Stephen's, [196] 744
 Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 956; *2R. [197] 1820, 1835, 1863
 Representation of the People Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 511
 Statutes, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1247
 Supply—House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476
  House of Lords Offices, [197] 1474
  Houses of Parliament, [197] 680, 681; Amendt. 684, 685
  Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1212
 Turnpikes, [198] 619
 Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 219

Kinnaird, Lord
 Army—School of Musketry at Hythe, Motion for Report, [197] 1593
 North British Railway—Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 566, 571
 Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 446; *cl.* 20, 456; *cl.* 68, 464

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
 Army—Medals for Service in India, [197] 624
 Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1314
 British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1104
 Canada—Dockyard Emigrants, [195] 1698
 Coal Mines, Regulation of, [195] 844
 Coronation Oath, The, [198] 908
 Dividends on Government Securities, [198] 800
 Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1769
 Foreign Office—Unpaid Attachés, Res. [197] 1674
 Game Laws (Scotland), Leave, [194] 535
 Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 586

[*cont.*

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F.—*cont.*
 Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [198] 1361; *cl.* 2, 1364, 1365
 India—Medals for Bhootan, [197] 1424
  Railways, [196] 744; [197] 1424; [198] 797
 India—East India Revenue Accounts, Res. [198] 1358
 Life Assurance Companies, Leave, [194] 585
 Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1222
 Metalliferous Mines, [194] 314
 Metropolis—New Public Offices, [197] 1671
 Navy—African Squadron, Motion for Returns, [195] 46
 Parliament—Morning Sittings, [197] 1187
 Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 194
 Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1734; Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 833; *cl.* 24, 1238, 1534
 Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 522
 Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1938
 South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 644, 648
 Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 804
 Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 926, 952
  Houses of Parliament, [197] 681, 685
  Land Registry Office, [198] 909, 910
  Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1703
  Stationery Office, [197] 1700
 Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 220
 Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 591
 Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 127

Kirk, Mr. W., *Newry*
 Greece—British Payments to, [194] 1896
 Ireland—Military Prison, Dublin, [198] 325
 Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1152; *cl.* 26, 1621; *cl.* 36, Amendt. [196] 66, 67, 72; *add. cl.* 423; Lords Amendts. [197] 1963; [198] 83, 582

Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. E. H. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Sandwich*
 Bridges, Repair of, [197] 1886
 Coal Mines, Accidents in, [194] 313
 County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 602, 619, 880
 Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture, [194] 1355
 Inclosure of Lands, [194] 1905; 3R. [195] 550
 Judicial Commission, The, [195] 975
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [196] 1450
 Metalliferous Mines, [194] 314
 Metropolis—Burlington House, [194] 1351
  Local Management, [194] 412
 Metropolitan Board of Works, [195] 674
 Metropolitan Police, [194] 1354
 Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1094
 Pollution of Rivers, [198] 453
 Salisbury Gaol—Removal of Prisoners, [194] 313
 Salmon Fishery Laws, [194] 2003; [195] 975
 Sheriff's (York County), [196] 1208
 Shrievalties of Yorkshire and Lancashire, [194] 411
 Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 125, 128

Knight, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
Army—Camping System, Major M'Gwire's, [197] 944; Motion for Papers, [198] 720
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [198] 1245
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 319

Knightley, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 147

Knox, Hon. Colonel W. Stuart, *Dungannon*
Army—Chaplains, [195] 678
Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, Amendt. [195] 563
Ireland—Fenianism, [194] 954, 1661
  Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, [195] 503, 506
  State Aid to Irish Nonconformists, [198] 153
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 726
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 868; *cl.* 12, 1111; *cl.* 18, 1415; *cl.* 36, [196] 71; *add. cl.* 425
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 231
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1093
  Dublin City Writ, Motion for Adjournment, [196] 1792
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1557

Laird, Mr. J., *Birkenhead*
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1818
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [197] 1769
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 551
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [195] 118
  New Works, [195] 215

Lambert, Mr. N. G., *Buckinghamshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1281
National Debt, Res. [198] 1211, 1214

Land Tax Commissioners Names Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 54]
Read 2° * *Mar* 17
Committee *—r.p. *June* 21
Committee *; Report *June* 24
Considered * *June* 25
Read 3° * *June* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *June* 29 (No. 158)
Read 2ª * *August* 2
Committee *; Report *August* 3
Read 3ª * *August* 5
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 64]

Land Tax Law Amendment, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 188]
Read 2° * *July* 8
Bill withdrawn * *July* 31

Land, Transfer of—Land Transfer Act, 1862
Question, Mr. T. Chambers; Answer, Mr. Stansfeld *Mar* 23, [194] 2000

Lands Clauses Consolidation Act Amendment Bill (*Mr. Bazley, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Graves, Mr. Baines, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Hibbert*)
c Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 3 [Bill 34]
Read 2° * *Mar* 11
Committee *; Report *Mar* 16
Considered * *Mar* 22
Read 3° * *Mar* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Halifax*) *April* 5 (No. 38)
Read 2ª * *April* 23
Committee * *April* 30
Report * *May* 3 (No. 90)
Read 3ª * *May* 4
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 18]

Langton, Mr. W. H. P. Gore-, *Somersetshire, W.*
Parliament—Bridgwater Election, [194] 2000

Lansdowne, Marquess of (Lord of the Treasury)
Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds, 2R. [198] 1062
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [196] 1585
Newspapers, &c. 2R. [196] 946, 969

"*Lavelle v. Proudfoot*"—*Case of*
Question, Observations, Mr. Charley, Mr. G. H. Moore; Reply, Mr. Gladstone *May* 28, [196] 881

Lawrence, Lord
Government of India Act Amendment, 1R. [195] 1088; Report, [196] 694
India—Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 545
Telegraphs, 2R. [198] 1135

Lawrence, Right Hon. Alderman J. C. (Lord Mayor), *Lambeth*
Emigration to Western Australia, [197] 1166
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1527
Supply—Royal Palaces, [197] 654
  Royal Parks, &c. [197] 659

Lawrence, Mr. Alderman W., *London*
Army—Saltpetre, Storage of, [195] 1584
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 161; Comm. *cl.* 14, [196] 1222; *cl.* 46, 1414; *cl.* 91, 1899
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [196] 849, 850
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1411; Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1773
Gold Coinage, The, [198] 1532, 1533
House Tax, Res. [197] 1802, 1807
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 695
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 342
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 554
Parliament — Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 191
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1523, 1530
Post Office—Foreign Mails, [194] 124

[*cont.*

Lawrence, Mr. Alderman W.—*cont.*
- Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 180
- Supply—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
  - Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1701, 1704
  - Rates on Government Property, [197] 1458
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 427; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), 639; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), Amendt. [196] 801, 803, 807
- Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 126

Lawson, Sir W., *Carlisle*
- Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [198] 1323, 1324
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007
- India—Opium Trade, [198] 449
- India—East India Revenue Accounts, Res. [198] 1194
- Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 742
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 637, 682, 683

Layard, Right Hon. A. H. (Chief Commissioner of Works), *Southwark*
- Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [195] 28
- Army—Buckingham Palace Guard Room, Motion for Papers, [197] 137
- Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 538, 553, 560
- Ireland—Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [195] 1098
- Kew Gardens, [197] 124
- Metropolis—Questions, &c.
  - Battersea Park, [195] 843
  - Courts of Justice, New, [195] 356, 1699, 1700; [196] 14, 1210
  - Finsbury Park, [196] 740
  - Hyde Park, [194] 485
  - National Gallery, The, [195] 975
  - Park Lane Improvements, [195] 1973
  - Public Offices, Concentration of, [195] 678 1973; [197] 1670, 1671
  - St. James' Park, [194] 410; [196] 13
  - Statues in Palace Yard, [196] 1742
  - Victoria Park, [194] 486; [196] 750
- Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [194] 139; Motion for a Committee, 278
- Metropolitan Railway—Palace Yard Station, [194] 1898
- Parliament—Crypt under St. Stephen's Chapel, [195] 676; [196] 744
  - Mosaics in the Houses of Parliament, [198] 448
  - Reporters' Gallery, [198] 898
- Parliament—Decoration of Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 710, 712
- Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 294, 1467
- Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, [197] 120; Res. 1586; [198] 20
- Supply—British Museum, [198] 225
  - Burlington House, [197] 1213, 1214
  - Chapter House, Westminster, [197] 1209, 1210
  - Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1464, 1467
  - Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677, 678

[*cont.*

Layard, Right Hon. A. H.—*cont.*
  - Houses of Parliament, [197] 680, 682, 683, 684; Report, 1431; Amendt. 1441, 1442, 1443
  - Land—New Palace, Westminster, [197] 679
  - National Gallery, The, [198] 502
  - Post Office, &c. Buildings, [197] 1456
  - Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1210, 1211
  - Public Buildings, [197] 675, 676
  - Public Offices Site, [197] 1202, 1203, 1204, 1207, 1208
  - Report, [198] 515, 517, 689
  - Royal Palaces, [197] 653
  - Royal Parks, &c. [197] 659, 660, 661, 663, 664, 668, 669
  - Works, &c. [197] 1706, 1707, 1708
- Thames Embankment and the Metropolitan Railway Company, [198] 1529

Lea, Mr. T., *Kidderminster*
- Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1399

Leatham, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
- Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1316
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1470, 1523
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 661

Lefevre, Mr. J. G. Shaw (Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Reading*
- Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 834
- Board of Trade Returns, [198] 703
- Bristol Pilots at Falmouth, [198] 1528
- Ceylon—Basses Lights, [198] 563
- Exeter, Trade of, [196] 1741
- Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 974
- Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1786
- Light Dues, Res. [196] 162
- "Marquess of Abercorn," Loss of the, [196] 1897
- Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 779
- Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1499, 1517
- Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 552
- Railway Accidents, [198] 726
- Regulation of Railways Act Amendment, Leave, [195] 24
- Scotland—Cumbrae Lights, [198] 799
- Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1924
- Supply—Board of Trade, [197] 1681
  - Distressed British Seamen, [198] 965
  - Harbours of Refuge, [197] 1456
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [197] 1463

Lefroy, Mr. A., *Dublin University*
- Irish Church, Comm. [195] 893; *cl.* 13, 1139, 1145; *cl.* 14, 1385; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1397; *cl.* 16, 1408; Lords Amendts. [197] 1961; [198] 580
- Supply—Education, National, [198] 741

Leinster, Duke of
- Dublin Freemen Commission, 3R. [198] 1288
- Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [197] 746; 3R. 1641

LEITRIM, Earl of
Ireland—State of, [195] 1972
Irish Church, 3R. [197] 1612; Commons Amendts. [198] 444
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1691

LENNOX, Lord H. G. C. G., *Chichester*
Local Museums, [197] 946
Metropolis—Courts of Justice, New, [196] 14
Navy—Ryde Pier, [197] 358
Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1622, 1626; [197] 412, 413
Navy Estimates—Salaries, [195] 62
Supply—Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1703, 1704
Science and Art Department, [198] 213, 218
Works, &c. [197] 1708

LESLIE, Colonel C. P., *Monaghan Co.*
Cab Stands (Metropolis), [197] 1169

LEWIS, Mr. J. D., *Devonport*
Army Estimates—Military Stores, [195] 668
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [198] 860
Navy—Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 375
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 936

Libel Bill
(*Mr. Baines, Mr. Candlish, Mr. Morley*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Baines*) *Feb* 23, [194] 276; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 17]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 17, 1599
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Newdegate*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate *April* 13, [195] 757; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 4 [Bill 106]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 14

LICHFIELD, Earl of
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 349; Comm. *cl.* 6, 1320; *cl.* 10, 1330, 1332; Amendt. 1333; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1337
Municipal Franchise, 2R. [197] 1417
Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), Comm. [198] 1072

LICHFIELD, Bishop of
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 213; Comm. *cl.* 2, 750, 752; *cl.* 14, 913; *cl.* 29, 1126; Report, 1521; Commons Amendts. [198] 444
New Zealand, [198] 784, 786

LIDDELL, Hon. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
China—Tien-tsin, Treaty of, Motion for Papers, [197] 1794
Coal Fields, Motion for an Address, [196] 1914
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 16, [197] 1291; *cl.* 63, 1532
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1739

[*cont.*

LIDDELL, Hon. H. G.—*cont.*
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [195] 1710; Comm. Amendt. [197] 553
Ireland—State of, [195] 2058
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1625; *cl.* 29, 1883; *cl.* 59, [196] 401; *cl.* 3, 423
Libel, 2R. [194] 1609
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 245
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 90, 96
Salaries, [195] 65
Navy—Naval Contracts, [198] 643
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 581
Poor Law—Payment of Rates by Owners, [194] 409
Poor Law, Res. [197] 439
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1583
Salmon Fisheries, [194] 2003
Steam Machinery, [195] 202, 216
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 177
Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 509
Valuation of Property, [194] 1660
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), 2R. [195] 23, 359
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 622

Life Assurance Companies Bill
(*Mr. S. Cave, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Russell Gurney*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *Mar* 3, [194] 585; Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1°* [Bill 35]
Read 2°* *April* 7
Committee*; Report *April* 8 [Bill 65]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 20

Life Peerages Bill
(*The Earl Russell*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after debate *April* 9, [195] 452 (No. 49)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 27, 1648
After debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day six months") (*Lord Denman*); after further short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *June* 3, [196] 1172; after short debate, House in Committee (No. 113)
Report *June* 8, 1370
Moved, "That the said Report be now received" (*The Earl Russell*)
After debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Malmesbury*); after further short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to; Report received; Amendments (*Earl Grey*) moved and negatived
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *July* 8, [197] 1387
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Earl of Malmesbury*); on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 76; Not-Cont. 106; M. 30; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 3ª on this day three months
Division List, Cont. and Not.-Cont., 1401

Life Peerages—Office of Lord High Chancellor of England
Motion for an Address, "praying that for the advantage of this House and for the honour of the legal profession Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to sanction the erection of the office of Lord High Chancellor of England into a barony which shall entitle the holder of that office to a writ of summons to Parliament by such title as Her Majesty shall in each case be pleased to summon him; and that such writ of summons as aforesaid shall make the person receiving the same, although he may not continue to hold the said office, a Peer of Parliament for life without remainder to the heirs of his body" (*The Lord Redesdale*) *May* 3, [196] 10; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

LIFFORD, Viscount
Contagious Diseases, [194] 284
Ireland—Mayor of Cork—Assassinations, [195] 1948
Irish Church, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1108; *cl.* 68, Amendt. 1256; Report, 1501; Commons Amendts. [198] 443

Light Dues
Moved, "That it is the opinion of this House, that the practice of charging upon the shipping of this Country and the shipping of Foreign Nations the cost of maintaining the Lights, Buoys, and Beacons which light and protect the shores of the United Kingdom should cease, as being a practice unworthy of a great maritime nation whose ships are afforded the use of the Lights of other Countries free of all expense" (*Mr. Headlam*) *May* 4, [196] 149; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Report—*Parl. P.* No. 100
Memorials 174

Lighthouse Accounts
Question, Viscount Bury; Answer, Mr. Bright *June* 3, [196] 1206

LIMERICK, Earl of
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1744; Report, [198] 146
Dublin Freemen Commission, 3R. [198] 1289
Ireland—Tithe Rent Charges, Motion for Returns, [194] 1081
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 33, Amendt. [197] 1154, 1155; 3R. Amendt. 1660
Militia, Comm. [195] 1847

LINDSAY, Hon. Colonel C. H., *Abingdon*
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1521

LINDSAY, Colonel R. J. Loyd, *Berkshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1162
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1558

LISMORE, Viscount
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1533

LLOYD, Sir T. D., *Cardigan, &c.*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1324
Emigration of Paupers, [194] 627

Loan Societies
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 11, [194] 1086

Local Government Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 21 [Bill 90]
Read 2° * *April* 22
Referred to Select Committee *May* 11
Report of Select Committee *June* 9 [Bill 155]
Committee *; Report *June* 17
Considered * *June* 18
Read 3° * *June* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *June* 22 (No. 140)
Read 2ª * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 124]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 192]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Committee *; Report *July* 8
Considered * *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *July* 12 (No. 183)
Read 2ª * *July* 20
Committee * *July* 22
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. cxxiv.]

Local Museums
Question, Lord Henry Lennox; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 1, [197] 946

Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Pim, Sir John Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 20 [Bill 87]
Read 2° * *May* 4
Committee *; Report *July* 20
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 29
Read 3° * *July* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *August* 2 (No. 250)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 79]

Local Taxation
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the present amount, incidence, and effect of Local Taxation, with a view to a more equitable re-adjustment of these burdens" (*Sir Massey Lopes*) *Feb* 23, [194] 223; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Observations, Sir George Jenkinson *Mar* 2, 534; Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 8, [195] 358; Question, Observations, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 16, 977; short debate thereon

LOCH, Mr. G., *Wick, &c.*
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1713, 1728 ; Nomination of Committee, [196] 628, 633, 1783, 1784
Game Laws (Scotland), Address for a Commission, [195] 2067
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 881
Park Lane and Piccadilly Thoroughfare, Motion for Papers, [195] 756
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 821 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1117, 1118
Supply—Report, [198] 696

LOCKE, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 330 ; 2R. [196] 1327 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 383 ; Amendt. 386 ; Consid. 1088
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1215
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1252
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1396 ; Comm. [195] 125 ; *cl.* 9, [196] 1744 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1771
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1784, 1795
Inclosure of Lands, 3R. [195] 556
Jersey Jurats, [197] 945
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 301
Metropolis Local Management, [194] 411
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 335 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 1058
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 545, 547
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1954
Police, The, and the Public, [198] 561, 562
Public Houses, &c. Res. [197] 454
Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 181
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 799, 800
Supply—Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1702
  Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), 2R. [195] 21
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 127

Lodgers Property Protection Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *April* 20 (No. 65)
Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª " *May* 11, [196] 562
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert (" this day three months ") ; Amendt., Motion, and Bill withdrawn

LONDON, Bishop of
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1742
Education, Public, [194] 821
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [197] 1880 ; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1883 ; *add. cl.* 1885
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1347
Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 308
Oriel College, Oxford, 2R. [194] 803

LONGFORD, Earl of
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. Amendt. [198] 1138 ; 3R. Amendt. 1285, 1289
Ireland—Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, [196] 1085, 1089
Irish Church, Report, [197] 1485, 1494
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 403

LOPES, Sir M., *Devonshire, S.*
Bishops, Retirement of, [195] 581
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 223, 271
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1361

LOPES, Mr. H. C., *Launceston*
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1181
Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1809
Married Women's Property, 2R. Amendt. [195] 774, 798

Lord Napier's Annuity Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 26 (No. 15)
Bill withdrawn *Mar* 8, [194] 932

Lord Napier of Magdala [Salary] Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Resolution in Committee *Mar* 15
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1º * *Mar* 16 [Bill 57]
Read 2º * *Mar* 18
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 19
Read 3º * *Mar* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*Duke of Argyll*) *April* 5 (No. 37)
Read 2ª * *April* 6
Committee * ; Report *April* 8
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 3]

LORNE, Marquess of, *Argyllshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 379
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1240

LOWE, Right Hon. R. (see CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER)

LOWTHER, Mr. J., *York City*
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 326
Assize Sentences on Criminals, [198] 1373
Cattle Disease—Foot and Mouth, [198] 1252
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1037
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 950 ; [198] 158
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 230
Endowed Schools, Comm. Amendt. [195] 124 ; *cl.* 4, [196] 1744 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1772, 1777
Hyde Park, Furious Riding in, [197] 1592
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 37, [196] 74 ; *cl.* 39, 280
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 343 ; Comm. *cl.* 34, Amendt. 1056
Navy—African Squadron, Motion for Returns, [195] 41
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [197] 130
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 234, 1105 ; *cl.* 24, 1233, 1245, 1388 ; *cl.* 59, 1442, 1445 ; 3R. 1497, 1498

LOWTHER, Mr. W., *Westmoreland*
British Museum—Temple Collection, [195] 1579
Foreign Office—Unpaid Attachés, Res. [197] 1672, 1676
Friendly Societies' Acts, [198] 896
Friendly Societies' Returns, [197] 571
Supply—Foreign Office, [197] 1679

Lucan, Earl of
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 68, [197] 1254

Lurgan, Lord
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [198] 1080; 3R. 1288
Irish Church, 3R. [197] 1604

Lush, Dr. J. A., *Salisbury*
Juvenile Offenders in Reformatory Schools, [196] 742
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 509
Salisbury Gaol—Removal of Prisoners, [194] 313

Lusk, Mr. Alderman A., *Finsbury*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1438
Army Estimates—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, [197] 149
  Martial Law, [195] 666
  Military Stores, [195] 668
  Militia, &c. [196] 1575
  Superannuation Allowances, [197] 149
Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 633
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 167; Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1215; *cl.* 13, 1220; *cl.* 46, 1415; *cl.* 54, 1597
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 873
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 838; *cl.* 4, 842, 843; *cl.* 18, 848
Diplomatic Salaries, &c. Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1336, 1338; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1339
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 15, [196] 1767
Foreign Office—Unpaid Attachés, Res. [197] 1675
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1797
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 18, [197] 582
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 344; Comm. *add. cl.* 1060
Navy—Australian Preserved Meat, [194] 487
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, [195] 90
  Naval Stores, [195] 193
  Salaries, [195] 61
  Victualling Yards, &c., [195] 181, 184
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1528
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1584
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 400
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 773
  Board of Trade, [197] 1682
  Chapter House, Westminster, [197] 1210
  Charity Commission, [197] 1683
  Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1471
  County Courts, [198] 908
  Dublin Metropolitan Police, [198] 911
  Emigration, [198] 961
  Excesses on Grants, [194] 771
  Foreign, &c. Services, [197] 1710
  Foreign Office, [197] 1677, 1680
  Harbours of Refuge, [197] 1456
  Home Office, [197] 1481
  Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1437
  Land—New Palace, Westminster, [197] 679
  Land Registry Office, [198] 909
  Lighthouses Abroad, [197] 1463
  Poor Law Commission, [197] 1692
  Post Office, &c. Buildings, [197] 1456
  Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211

Lusk, Mr. Alderman A.—*cont.*
  Public Buildings, [197] 674
  Public Offices Site, [197] 1204
  Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1461
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Department (Scotland), Amendt. [197] 1710
  Rates on Government Property, [197] 1457, 1459
  Report, [194] 536, 537
  Royal Palaces, [197] 652
  Royal Parks, &c. [197] 657, 667
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 623
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 129

Lyttelton, Lord
Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 8
Bishops Resignation, Report, [198] 146
Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1868, 1870; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1876; *cl.* 15, 1880, 1881; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1882; *cl.* 30, 1884
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1329, 1350
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [197] 752; 3R. 1610
Parliament—Order in the House, [198] 150
University Tests, 2R. [198] 143

Lyveden, Lord
Education, Public, [194] 817
Government of India Act Amendment, 1R. [195] 1085; 2R. 1832; Report, [196] 692
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1068
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 17, Amendt. [194] 1344
India—Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 551
Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 436
Life Peerages, Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 1200; Report, 1390; 3R. [197] 1391
New Zealand, [198] 793, 794

McArthur, Mr. W., *Lambeth*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 395
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 287
Jamaica—Disendowment of the Church, [198] 1542
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 554
Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays, [196] 1275
Ways and Means—Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 808

McClean, Mr. J. R., *Staffordshire, E.*
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 574

McClure, Mr. T., *Belfast*
Ireland—Municipal Franchise, [194] 1185
Irish Church, Comm. *add. cl.* [196] 424; Lords Amendts. [198] 31

McCombie, Mr. W., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1275; *cl.* 45, 1528; *cl.* 60, Amendt. 1529; *cl.* 63, 1534; *cl.* 67, 1538; Amendt. 1540; *cl.* 90, 1756; *add. cl.* 1770
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], 2R. [197] 502
Malt Duties, [194] 625

MacEvoy, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [194] 186, 412, 488 ; [197] 1169
Ireland—Prelates of the Irish Church, [196] 261

Macfie, Mr. R. A., *Leith, &c.*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), 2R. [197] 855
Army—Committee on New Arms, [198] 495
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1168
Canada—Patent Law, [198] 1293
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 681
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1567
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [197] 1221
Financial Statement—Corn Duty, [195] 479
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1728
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [195] 1479 ; Lords Amendts. [198] 588
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1516
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 3R. [198] 1341
National Debt, Res. [198] 1213
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 88
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 1242; *cl.* 66, 1447 ; Consid. 1457
Patent Laws, [198] 1089, 1090
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 888
Post Office—Book Post, &c. [194] 1895
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 244
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1308
Sunday Trading, 2R. [194] 562
Supply—Report, [198] 692
  Stationery Office, [197] 1699
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [198] 764 ; *cl.* 20, 772
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 429

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
Agricultural Returns, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [195] 755 ; *[197] 823, 831
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1772
Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 973
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1725
Game Laws (Scotland), Address for a Commission, [195] 2065
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], Leave, [194] 534 ; 2R. [197] 499
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 389
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1733 ; Comm. *cl.* 9, [198] 1119
Pharmacy Act Amendment, Comm. [195] 1934

McLaren, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), Leave, [194] 280, 282 ; 2R. [197] 838, 863
Army Estimates—Superannuation Allowances, [197] 150
Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 630
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1314
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 157
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1412 ; Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1769

[*cont.*

McLaren, Mr. D.—*cont.*
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1815
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 378
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1626 ; *cl.* 39, [196] 274, 276 ; *cl.* 59, 405
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 361 ; *cl.* 1, 366
Nomenclature of Diseases, [194] 1789
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1723 ; 198] Comm. 813 ; *cl.* 1, 820 ; *cl.* 2, 829, 1098 ; *cl.* 4, 1113 ; *cl.* 9, 1120, 1121 ; *cl.* 12, 1121 ; *cl.* 14, 1122 ; *cl.* 17, 1123 ; *cl.* 19, 1124 ; *cl.* 24, 1239 ; *cl.* 34, 1390 ; *cl.* 44, 1392 ; *cl.* 59, 1443 ; Consid. 1461
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 678
Real Property, Res. [196] 598
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1031
Scotland—Public Business, [198] 1296
Scotland—Endowed Schools, &c. Motion for a Commission, [196] 1442
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 524
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1480
Supply—Board of Manufactures (Scotland), [198] 506
  Learned Societies, [198] 506
  Public Offices Site, [197] 1208
  Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1461, 1462
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Department, [197] 1711
  Rates on Government Property, [197] 1458
  Report, [198] 694
  Stationery Office, [197] 1698
  Works, &c. [197] 1708
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 421 ; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.) 619, 640

McMahon, Mr. P., *New Ross*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1413 ; *add. cl.* [197] 419
County Courts, 2R. [196] 686
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 573
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [198] 1274
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 174 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [197] 430, 572, 578
Ireland—Poor Law, [194] 111
  Representation of, [194] 362
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1623 ; *cl.* 32, [196] 36 ; *cl.* 52, Amendt. 350 ; Consid. 758 ; Amendt. 778
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 88
Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment, [194] 484 ; 2R. [195] 309

Magniac, Mr. C., *St. Ives*
Irish Church, Consid. *add. cl.* [196] 779
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 468

Maguire, Mr. J. F., *Cork City*
Army—Clerks of the Works and Royal Engineers, [197] 136
  3rd West India Regiment, [194] 1789
Bell, James, Case of, [198] 1294
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 229

[*cont.*

MAGUIRE, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
Ireland—Cork, Mayor of, [195] 359 ;—Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1170
Fenian Convicts—O'Donovan Rossa, [198] 1432
State of, [195] 2041
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 680, 726
Irish Church, Lords Amendts. [198] 63
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 550
Navy Estimates—New Works, [195] 210, 212
O'Farrell Papers, The, [196] 20
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 202 ; 2R. 576, 583
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 336
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 815
Prisons (Religious Instruction), Motion for Returns, [198] 345, 352
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [196] 1456
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1466, 1473, 1475
Supply — Education, Public, [198] 727, 738, 742
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 624

MALMESBURY, Earl of
Dublin Freemen Commission, 3R. [198] 1287
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1535
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 28, [197] 1026 ; *cl.* 68, 1234 ; Commons Amendts. [198] 427
Life Peerages, 2R. [195] 1666 ; Report, Amendt. [196] 1381, 1389 ; 3R. Amendt. [197] 1387
National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 662
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 405

Malta
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient, in accordance with pledges given in the name of the Sovereign, to restore to the people of Malta, with such modifications as present circumstances may require, their ancient representative institution, the 'Congresso Popolare;' to re-establish the Executive Council' as a distinct body, aiding the Governor in administering the Civil Affairs of the Island ; and, reverting to the policy abandoned in 1859, to sever the office of 'Civil Governor' from that of 'Commander of the Forces" (*Mr. Robert Torrens*) *July* 13, [197] 1774; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
New Port and Docks at, Question, Mr. Onslow ; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 27, [195] 1695 (*Parl. P.* No. 217)

Malt Duties
Question, Mr. M'Combie ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, [194] 625 ; Question, Sir George Jenkinson ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 4, [198] 1247 Returns 1868—(*Parl. P.* 228)

MANCHESTER, Duke of
Ireland—Portadown Inquest, [197] 1737 ; [198] 123
Irish Church, Report, [197] 1499 ; Commons Amendts. [198] 319

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R., *Leicestershire, N.*
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1247, 1249, 1269
Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 559
Inclosure of Lands, 3R. [195] 554
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1850
Protection of Life, [196] 470
State of, [195] 2017
195] Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 10, 1107 ; *cl.* 15, 1404 ; *cl.* 18, 1415 ; *cl.* 22, 1512, 1515 ; *cl.* 25, 1614 ; *cl.* 27, 1858, 1880 ; *cl.* 19, 1932
196] *cl.* 32, 51 ; *cl.* 39, 130 ; *cl.* 59, 403
197] Lords Amendts. 1960
198] 75, 121
Metropolis—Public Offices, Concentration of, [195] 677
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 241
Parliament — House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 271
Parliament—Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Res. [197] 964
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1540
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Return [198] 1030
Supply—Burlington House, [197] 1214
Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1471
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1466, 1467
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677
Houses of Parliament, [197] 683, 685 ; Report, 1435
Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1213
Public Offices Site, [197] 1203, 1209
Rates on Government Property, [197] 1458
Royal Palaces, [197] 654
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 656, 663, 664, 667, 668
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1385
United States — Recent Negotiations with, [197] 1427

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Childers, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 9
Read 2° * *Mar* 18
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 19
Considered * *Mar* 22
Read 3° * *Mar* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Camperdown*) *April* 5
Read 2ª * *April* 6
Committee * ; Report *April* 8
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 5]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
Education, Public, [194] 815
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 8, [197] 1875 ; *cl.* 15, 1880 ; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 1884
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 26, [197] 999 ; *cl.* 28, 1039 ; Commons Amendts. Amendt. [198] 315, 433, 444
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [194] 1771 ; [195] 567 ; Comm. [196] 443 ; *cl.* 1, 446 ; *cl.* 20, 453 ; *cl.* 68, Amendt. 462, 464
University Tests, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1095

"Marquess of Abercorn"—Loss of the
Question, Sir John Hay ; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *June* 15, [196] 1897

Marriage Law Commission Report
Question, Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *April* 5, [195] 135; Observations, Question, Sir Roundell Palmer; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *August* 6, [198] 1395

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill (*Mr. Thomas Chambers, Mr. Morley*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Thomas Chambers*)
194] *Feb* 25, 331; Bill ordered, after short debate
Read 1° * *Feb* 26 [Bill 23]
195] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 21, 1288
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.; A. 243, N. 144; M. 99; Bill read 2°
. Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1325
196] Order for Committee read *June* 8, 1448
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to make provision for a woman to marry her deceased husband's brother" (*Mr. Collins*); after short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*); A. 63, N. 113; M. 50
Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Cross*); A. 63, N. 98; M. 35
Question again proposed; Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. R. Fowler*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
197] Adjourned debate [8th June] resumed *June* 22, 466
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); A. 52, N. 100; M. 48
Question again proposed; after short debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); A. 43, N. 101; M. 58
Question again proposed; Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Colonel Barttelot*); after further short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned debate [8th June] resumed *July* 1; Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on Question [8th June]
"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make provision therein for a woman to marry her deceased husband's brother" (*Mr. Collins*)
198] Question again proposed; Debate resumed *July* 20, 357
Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "the Order for the Committee on the said Bill be read and discharged" (*Mr. John Talbot*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 143, N. 57; M. 86
Main Question again proposed; Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Sir John Hay*); A. 43, N. 145; M. 102
Main Question put, and negatived
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, that they have power to make [*cont.*

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—cont.
198] provision for a man to marry his deceased wife's brother's or sister's daughter" (*Mr. Monk*) *July* 20; Question put, and negatived
Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *August* 4

Married Women's Property Bill (*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Jacob Bright*)
194] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Russell Gurney*) *Feb* 25, 331; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 20]
195] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 14, 760
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Lopes*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on April 22, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Russell Gurney (Chairman), Mr. Amphlett, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Cross, Mr. Dowse, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Jessel, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Lopes, Mr. Pemberton, Mr. Scourfield, Sir John Simeon, Mr. Solicitor General
Report of Select Committee *May* 13 (No. 210)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 17
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 9
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Henley*); A. 47, N. 38; M. 9; Debate adjourned
198] Adjourned debate on Question [9th July], "That the Bill be now read 3°;" Question again proposed; Debate resumed *July* 21, 401
After short debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c."; A. 131, N. 33; M. 98; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3° [Bill 122]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Penzance*) *July* 22 (No. 212)
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 30, 979; after short debate, Bill read 2ª

MARTIN, Mr. C. Wykeham, *Newport, Isle of Wight*
Army Estimates—Buildings and Repairs, [195] 669

MARTIN, Mr. P. Wykeham, *Rochester*
Army—Gunpowder Magazines at Upnor, [197] 1168
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 397
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 232
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1816
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1641
Navy—Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 377
Supply — Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 509
Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 974

Matthews, Mr. H., *Dungarvan*
Ireland—Seizure of Fishing Smacks, [197] 949
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1790
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1476

Mauritius—Reported Famine
Question, Mr. R. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 18, [194] 1657

Medical Education and Registration—General Council of
Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 6, [197] 1269

Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Brady, Mr. Pim, Mr. Trant Hamilton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 48]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 23, [197] 486; after debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 29 [Bill 185]
Re-comm.*; Report *July* 5
Considered * *July* 7
Read 3° * *July* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Granard*) *July* 9 (No. 180)
Read 2ª * *July* 19
Committee * *July* 22
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 50]

Mellor, Mr. T. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Ireland—Property of the Irish Church, [194] 1461
Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 183
Supply—House of Commons Offices, [197] 1477
Royal Palaces, [197] 653

Melly, Mr. G., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 391; Consid. 1085
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1817
*Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1189, 1227, 1252
Irish Church, [198] 84
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 172
Foreign Office, [197] 1679
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 420

Melville, Viscount
Parliament—Business of the House, [198] 15
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Commons Amendts. [198] 1471

Mercantile Marine — Consolidation of Statutes
Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Bright *Feb* 22, [194] 156

Merchant Seamen, Diet of
Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Bright *Mar* 16, [194] 1463

Merchant Shipping and Navigation Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Acts read; considered in Committee *August* 9, [198] 1499; after debate, a Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 267]

Merchant Shipping (Colonial), 1869, Bill
[H.L.] (*The Earl Granville*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 13 (No. 56)
Read 2ª * *April* 15
Committee *; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª * *April* 20
c. Read 1° * *April* 22 [Bill 91]
Read 2° * *April* 26
Committee *; Report *April* 27
Considered * *April* 28
Read 3° * *April* 29
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 11]

Metropolis
Burlington House, Question, Lord Ronald Gower; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 15, [194] 1351
Cab Stands, Question, Colonel Leslie; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 5, [197] 1169
Cremorne Gardens—Special Licences, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 14, [196] 1743
Hammersmith Bridge—The University Boat Race, Question, Viscount Bury; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 4, [194] 640; *Mar* 16, 1467
Marlborough Street Police Court, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 23, [198] 561
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Papers relating to the Charge made by the Police against three young men on the night of the 30th June last, and tried before Mr. Knox, the Police Magistrate at Marlborough Street" (*Mr. Eykyn*) *August* 3, 1218; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Metropolis Local Management, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 23, [194] 206
Metropolis Local Management Act—Returns, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 1, [194] 411
Returns 1867-8—(*Parl. P.* No. 435)
Metropolitan Police Force, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 15, [194] 1354
Metropolitan Railway—Palace Yard Station, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 22, [194] 1898
Night Houses, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 29, [195] 1852
Palace Yard, Semaphore near, Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 11, [194] 1088
Park Lane and Piccadilly Thoroughfare, Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of all Correspondence which has passed since the month of February 1865, inclusive, between the Lords of the Treasury, the First Commissioner of Works, the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and the Metropolitan Board of Works, on the

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.
subject of any proposed thoroughfare between Park Lane and Piccadilly (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 132, of Session 1865)" (*Mr. Loch*) *April* 13, [195] 756; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. C. B. Denison; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 30, 1973
Park Lane and Hamilton Place—Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 168)
Police Interference with Passengers, Question, Mr. Eaton; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 9, [195] 477

Poor Law
St. Marylebone Workhouse School, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 1, [197] 944
St. Pancras Workhouse, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 13, [197] 1754; Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 14, 1820

Public Offices—(See that Title)

Public Parks
Battersea Park, Question, Mr. Peek; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 15, [195] 843
Finsbury Park, Questions, Mr. W. M. Torrens, Viscount Enfield; Answers, Mr. Layard, Mr. Tite *May* 13, [196] 740
Hyde Park, Question, Mr. W. Cowper; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 2, [194] 485—*Conviction for Furious Riding*, Question, The Earl of Winchilsea; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 5, [197] 1105; Observations, Captain White; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *July* 9, 1591
St. James's Park — Bathing, Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 3, [196] 12 — *Open Spaces of*, Question, Sir Henry Hoare; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 1, [194] 410
Victoria Park, Question, Mr. C. Reed; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 2, [194] 486; Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 13, [196] 749

St. Luke's Hospital, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 13, [195] 677
Statues in Palace Yard, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 14, [196] 1742 — *Canning Statue*, Question, Lord Stratheden; Answer, Earl Granville *August* 9, [198] 1484

Metropolis Gas Bills
Moved, "That the Imperial Gas Bill and the Bills of all other Companies supplying the Metropolis with Gas be referred to the same Committee" (*Mr. Thomas Chambers*) *Feb* 25, [194] 300; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Metropolis Local Management Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 29 (No. 86)
Bill withdrawn * *June* 24

Metropolitan Board of Works
Parl. Papers—
Report for 1867-8 . . . (No. 23)
Returns . . . . . . (No. 24)
Report and Account . (No. 436)
Main Drainage—Barking Creek Outfall, Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 6, [196] 260; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 8, 1402
Memorial—Sewage—(*Parl. P.* No. 231)
Mortality at Barking, Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 24, [197] 514
Returns—(*Parl. P.* No. 278)
Report, 1868, Question, Mr. A. Johnston; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *April* 13, [195] 674
Thames Embankment — Proposed Viaduct, Observations, Lord Elcho, Viscount Bury; Reply, Mr. Layard; short debate thereon *Feb* 19, [194] 133
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the Roadway and Viaduct proposed to be made on the Thames Embankment from Hungerford Bridge to Wellington Street, Strand, and whether the site might not be more advantageously occupied by some Public Building; also to inquire whether any, and if so what, controlling power over Public Works in the Metropolis is vested in and exercised by any Government Department" (*Lord Elcho*) *Feb* 23, 277; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 2, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Elcho (Chairman), Mr. Bentinck, Viscount Bury, Mr. Buxton, Mr. William Cowper, Captain Dawson-Damer, Sir C. W. Dilke, Mr. W. H. Gregory, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence, Mr. Layard, Mr. M'Clean, Lord John Manners, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. William Henry Smith, and Sir W. Tite
Thames Embankment and the Metropolitan Railway Company, Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, Mr. Layard *August* 10, [198] 1528
Thames Embankment (*South Side*), Question, Mr. Guest; Answer, Mr. Tite *April* 23, [195] 1464

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen*)
c. Resolutions in Committee *June* 24
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 25 [Bill 181]
198] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *July* 20, 326; after short debate, Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *July* 21, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ayrton (Chairman), Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Thomas Chambers, Mr. Cross, Mr. M'Laren, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Mr. William Henry Smith
Report of Select Committee *July* 23 [Bill 238]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 31
. Considered *August* 2, 1127
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 3

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill—cont.

198] Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed to consider of a Proviso to Clause 22" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" Amendt. withdrawn; Question again proposed, Debate adjourned

Adjourned Debate, on Question [3rd August], "That the Bill be now read 3° ;" Question again proposed; Debate resumed *August* 5, 1335

Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed to a Committee of the whole House in respect of a Proviso to Clause 22, and a new Clause for restricting the sale of park lands" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 6 (No. 280)
Read 2ª * *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 102]

Metropolitan Building Act (1855) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)

c. Ordered * *July* 6
Read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 214]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Considered * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Morley*) *July* 27 (No. 232)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 82]

Metropolitan Commons Act (1866) Amendment Bill (*Mr. T. Chambers, Mr. Locke*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 13 [Bill 77]
Read 2°, * and referred to a Select Committee *May* 31
And, on *June* 16, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Thomas Chambers (Chairman), Colonel Barttelot, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Buxton, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Andrew Johnston, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Knight, Mr. Charles Reed, Mr. Henry Samuelson, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Frederick Stanley, Mr. Rowland Winn, Mr. William Cowper, and Mr. Gerard Sturt
Report of Select Committee *July* 19 (*Parl. P.* No. 334)
Report * *July* 19 [Bill 221]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 28
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 3
Considered * *August* 4
Read 3° * *August* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Devon*) *August* 5 (No. 271)
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 107]

Metropolitan Commons Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 1 [Bill 30]
Read 2° * *Mar* 5
Committee *; Report *Mar* 15
Read 3° * *Mar* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *Mar* 18 (No. 35)
Read 2ª * *June* 7
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3ª * *June* 11
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 63]

Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Goschen, Mr. A. Peel, Mr. Ayrton*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Goschen*) *Mar* 16, [194] 1534; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° *
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 28, [196] 946; after debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 7, 1340
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the present condition of the Ratepayers of the Metropolis, and of the burthens laid upon them for the relief of the sick and infirm, it is not expedient to adopt any further measures of legislation until full inquiry shall have been made into the existing extent of hospital accommodation, and how far the same may be made adequate to meet the want of the sick poor not relieved in their own dwellings" (*Mr. W. M. Torrens*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Question put; A. 118, N. 15; M. 103; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 53]
Committee *—R.P. *June* 25
Committee *—R.P. *July* 20
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Considered * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 27 (No. 235)
Read 2ª * *July* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 63]

Metropolitan Regulations Bill
(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 29 (No. 87)
Bill withdrawn * *June* 24

Metropolitan Street Tramways Bill (by Order)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 3, [194] 542
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Pease*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 209, N. 78; M. 131; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Bill, as amended, further considered *May* 13, [196] 735

Mexican Bondholders

Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 29, [198] 897

Mexico—Diplomatic Relations with

Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Otway *April* 15, [195] 845; Question, Mr. Somerset Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 17, [197] 119

Miall, Mr. E., *Bradford*
Bahamas—Ecclesiastical Grant, [195] 581
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1768
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1856 ; Lords Amendts. [198] 590

Milbank, Mr. F. A., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
Language used in Debate in the other House, [198] 368

Militia Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Major Vivian*)
195] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Cardwell*) *April* 15, 941 ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 82]
Read 2° * *April* 20
. Committee; Report, after short debate *April* 22, 1417
. Read 3°, after short debate *April* 23, 1532
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Northbrook*) *April* 26 (No. 76)
Read 2ª * *April* 27
. Committee *April* 29, 1846 (No. 83)
Report * *May* 3
196] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *May* 4, 86 ; after debate, Bill read 3ª
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 13]

Militia (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 20 [Bill 228]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee * ; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *August* 2 (No. 252)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee * ; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 80]

Militia Pay Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Captain Vivian*)
c. Ordered * *June* 18
Read 1° * *July* 19
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee * ; Report *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Northbrook*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee * ; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 66]

Millbank Prison Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Northbrook*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *July* 27 (No. 234)
Read 2ª * *July* 30
Committee * ; Report *August* 2
Read 3ª * *August* 3
c. Read 1° * *August* 3 [Bill 258]
Read 2° * *August* 4
Committee * ; Report *August* 5
Considered * *August* 6
Read 3° * *August* 6
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 95]

Miller, Mr. J., *Edinburgh* (*City*)
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), Leave, [194] 280 ; 2R. [197] 858
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 34, Amendt. [197] 1293 ; *cl.* 56, Amendt. 1529 ; *cl.* 63, 1533 ; *cl.* 122, Amendt. 1765, 1766
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2040 ; 3R. [196] 1041
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 804 ; *cl.* 1, 818 ; Amendt. 823 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 835 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1118, 1120 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1124 ; *cl.* 65, Amendt. 1445, 1446
Scotland—Questions, &c.
Income Tax, [196] 471
Queen's Remembrancer, [194] 1187
Sheriff Courts, [196] 1633
Waternish Church, Isle of Skye, [197] 1886
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 528
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [197] 682
Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1212
Learned Societies, [198] 504
Public Offices Site, [197] 1207
Report, [198] 693
Stationery Office, [197] 1697, 1699; Amendt. 1700

Mills, Mr. C. H., *Kent, W.*
Navy—Barnes, Mr. W., Case of, [195] 842

Milton, Viscount, *Yorkshire, W. R.—S.*
Canada—Boundaries, [198] 1440
Convention of Paris, Motion for Papers, [196] 1446
United States—Island of San Juan, [198] 1248

Mines
Metalliferous Mines—Legislation in respect to, Question, Mr. Kinnaird ; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Feb* 25, [194] 312 ; Question, Lord Elcho ; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 26, [198] 865—*Rating of,* Question, Mr. St. Aubyn ; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 1, [194] 407 ; Question, Colonel Duncombe ; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 20, [195] 1582
Mold—Riot at, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 7, [196] 1296
(See *Coal Mines, Accidents in*)

Mines Regulation Bill (*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 84]
Read 2° * *May* 6
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Minto, Earl of
North British Railway — Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 569
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 20, [196] 457 ; Amendt. 460
Scotland—Courts of Law Commission, [195] 1575
Police Systems, [196] 703

Mitchell, Mr. T. A., *Bridport*
India—Finance, [195] 478

MITFORD, Mr. W. T., *Midhurst*
  Contagious Diseases, [194] 303
  Contagious Diseases Act, Motion for a Committee, [196] 808
  Gilbert Unions, [194] 626

MONCK, Viscount
  Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1420, 1451
  Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1894; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [197] 753; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 754; *cl.* 29, 1135
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 33, 44
  Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1548

Money Laws (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Delahunty, Mr. Blake, Mr. Dawson*)
c. Considered in Committee; a Resolution agreed to *Feb* 23, [194] 273; Bill ordered; read 1° *
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 23, [197] 471 [Bill 16]
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Frederick W. Heygate*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester*
  Assessed Taxes, Collection of, [194] 1086
  Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1322
  Canada—Railway Loan, Res. [197] 1448, 1455
  Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. Amendt. [198] 1327
  Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 539
  Consecration Fees, [194] 309
  Court of Probate (Registrar Clerks), [196] 1495
  Courts of Justice—Carey Street, [198] 1143, 1144, 1529
  Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1783, 1788
  Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2 [195] 1035
  Marriage Laws, [198] 1404
  Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. Instruction, [197] 467, 470; [198] 362
  Revenue Officers, Leave, [194] 271; 2R. 1573, 1598
  Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1468, 1471
    Consular Services, [198] 954
    Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1464, 1465
    Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
    Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 678
    Houses of Parliament, [197] 679; Amendt. 681
    Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1212
    Learned Societies, [198] 504; Amendt. 505
    Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 972
    Nonconforming Clergy, [198] 965
    Poor Law Administration, [198] 507
    Probate Court and Registries, Amendt. [197] 1210
    Public Buildings, [197] 676
    Public Offices Site, [197] 1207
    Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1460, 1462
    Record Office, [197] 1693
    Stationery Office, [197] 1697
  Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 5, [198] 771; *cl.* 24, 772
  Turkey—Cretan Insurgents, [195] 1098
  Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 616

MONSELL, Right Hon. W. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Limerick Co.*
  Bahamas—Ecclesiastical Grant, [195] 581
  British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1107, 1115
  Canada—Questions, &c.
    Dockyard Emigrants, [195] 1698; [196] 105
    Hudson's Bay Company, [194] 309; [195] 583, 680; [196] 1497; [197] 1526
    Intercolonial Railway, [196] 878
    Patent Law, [198] 1293
  Cape of Good Hope—Boers of the Trans-Vaal Republic, [197] 1342
    Enslavement of Kaffir Children, [194] 131
  China—Hong Kong Gambling Houses, [197] 1667
    Legislative Council, [198] 153
  Colonial Returns, [196] 470
  Emigration Commission, [195] 580
  Emigration to Western Australia, [197] 1166
  Fenianism in Australia, [195] 31
  Gambia—Prisoners in Bathurst Gaol, [198] 105
  Gibraltar Convict Prison, [194] 953
  Ireland—Fenian Conspiracy, [194] 1791
  Irish Church, 3R. [196] 1023
  Jamaica—Disendowment of the Church, [198] 1542
  Malta, Res. [197] 1676
  Mauritius—Famine in, Reported, [194] 1657
  Natal—Green, Rev. Mr., Case of, [196] 467
  Newfoundland Confederation, [194] 1091
  New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 477
    Imperial Troops in the Colony, [195] 676
  O'Farrell Papers, The, [195] 1741; [196] 19
  Order of St. Michael and St. George, [194] 1349
  Parliament—Returns, [194] 111
  Post Office—Communication with Australia, [195] 140
  Queensland—Alleged Slavery in, [196] 571; [197] 641, 644
  Sierra Leone—Thomas *v.* Huggins, Case of, Res. [198] 1216
  South Sea Islands, Slave Trade from the, [197] 641, 644
  Supply—Colonies, Grants in Aid, [198] 958, 960
    Emigration, [198] 962
    Tonnage Bounties, [198] 961
  Tasmania—Public Worship, [194] 1086
  West Indies, The, [197] 1889
    Clergy in the, [194] 2001

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R., *Huntingdonshire*
  Cattle Plague—Diseased Foreign Sheep, [195] 1363, 1364, 1467
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Leave, [194] 90; 2R. 996, 1034
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 677, 678; 2R. [195] 445; [196] 1498; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1271, 1279; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1291
  Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 117
  Pharmacy Act Amendment, Leave, [194] 683; Comm. [195] 1934
  Supply—Education, Public, [198] 180, 185
    Science and Art Department, [198] 215

Montgomery, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), Leave, [194] 280 ; 2R. Amendt. [197] 843
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 392
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 814 ; *cl.* 1, 821 ; Comm. 1108 ; *cl.* 4, 1112 ; *cl.* 8, 1118 ; *cl.* 9, 1120 ; *cl.* 24, 1238, 1387 ; Consid. Amendt. 1459
Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, [194] 1185 ; Motion for a Return, 1265, 1273
Supply—Board of Manufactures (Scotland), [198] 507
Report, [198] 519

Montrose, Duke of
North British Railway—Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 569
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 11

Moore, Mr. G. H., *Mayo Co*
Ireland—Fenian Convicts—O'Donovan Rossa, [198] 1422
"Lavelle *v.* Proudfoot," Case of, [196] 884
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1160, 1166, 1171
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2061 ; Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1625 ; *cl.* 27, 1867 ; *cl.* 39, [196] 283 ; Lords Amendts. [198] 57, 67
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 366 ; Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 613
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 195
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 798, 808, 812, 814, 815
Supply—Education, National, [198] 740

Morgan, Mr. G. O., *Denbighshire*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 315
Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1322
*Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1308
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 788
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 650
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 819
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1854
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1433 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1094
Wales—Riots at Mold, [196] 1296

Morley, Earl of
Aggravated Assaults Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [196] 564
Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [196] 1585
Contagious Diseases, [194] 284
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [194] 1323
Industrial Schools (Great Britain), 2R. [196] 354
Infant Life Preservation, 2R. [197] 1739
North British Railway—Accidental Deaths, Motion for a Paper, [196] 571
Reformatory Schools Amendment, 2R. [196] 352
Salmon Fishery Act (Scotland), [197] 1753
Scotland—Courts of Law Commission, [195] 1575
Police Systems, [196] 704
Scotland—Salmon Fisheries, Motion for a Return, [194] 1082
Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 992 ; Comm. 1070
University Tests, 2R. [198] 133

Morley, Mr. S., *Bristol*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 791 ; 2R. [195] 162 ;
196] Comm. *cl.* 6, 1216 ; *cl.* 7, 1218 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1220 ; *cl.* 14, 1222 ; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 1402, 1403 ; *cl.* 46, 1406, 1415 ; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1416 ; *cl.* 53, Amendt. 1592; *cl.* 54, 1597 ; *cl.* 59, 1602 ; *cl.* 88, 1606; *cl* 91, Amendt. 1607, 1608, 1898 ; *cl.* 118, 1900 ; *cl.* 126, *ib.*, 1903, 1905 ; *cl.* 129, 1907
197] *cl.* 130, 317 ; *cl.* 131, 415 ; *add. cl.* 418, 419
198] Lords Amendts. 1094, 1095, 1125
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1567
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 835
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 576 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 580
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [197] 681
Wisley Common, Motion for a Committee, [195] 129

Morrison, Mr. W., *Plymouth*
Imperial Gas, Consid. Amendt. [195] 1782, 1798
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 40 ; *cl.* 59, 409 ; Lords Amendts. [198] 83
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [196] 1950
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Comm. [194] 1546
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 927
Regina *v.* Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 993
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1928

Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R., *Oxford University*
Bishops Resignation, Comm. [198] 1311, 1312
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1746 ; *cl.* 15, 1766 ; *cl.* 29, 1773
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2026
University Tests, Leave, [194] 273 ; 2R. Amendt. 1045, 1046, 1054 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 788 ; *cl.* 6, 793

Mundella, Mr. A. J., *Sheffield*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1430
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1166
County Courts, 2R. [196] 685
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1243
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1774
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 350
Navy—Naval Contracts, [198] 644, 649
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 63
Bewdley Writ, [194] 664
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 914
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 510
Post Office—Inland Postage, Res. [195] 243
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1541
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 819
Regina *v.* Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 980
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 178
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1373

Municipal Corporations (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Buxton, Mr. Thomas Hughes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 8 [Bill 39]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 16, [196] 1939
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Bentinck*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" put, and agreed to; main Question put, and negatived; Bill withdrawn

Municipal Franchise Bill
(*Mr. Herbert, Mr. Hodgkinson, Mr. Candlish*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 15 [Bill 85]
Read 2°* *May* 4
Committee*; Report *May* 10
Considered* *June* 7
Read 3°* *June* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Lichfield*) *June* 11 (No. 125)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 8, [197] 1417; Bill read 2ª
Committee* *July* 13 (No. 187)
Report *July* 19, [198] 145 (No. 200)
Read 3ª* *July* 22
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 55]

Municipal Magistrates, Removal of
Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 11, [196] 572; Question, Earl Grey; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *June* 1, 1085
(See *O'Sullivan's Disability*)

Muntz, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Army—Henry-Martini Rifle, [198] 1370
New Arms, Committee on, [198] 498
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 394
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 795; Comm. *cl.* 14, [196] 1223; *cl.* 46, 1414; *cl.* 49, 1417; *cl.* 54, 1597; *cl.* 88, 1606
Bills of Exchange, Res. [197] 140
County Courts, 2R. [196] 686
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 24, [196] 853; *cl.* 26, 854
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 567
Factory Acts—Hours of Labour, [195] 1851
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1006; *cl.* 1, 1013
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 349
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1740
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1798
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 618, 623
Navy—Contracts, [195] 51; [198] 633
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, Amendt. [194] 663
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 994
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 801
Supply—Admiralty Court Registry, [198] 911
Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1473
Consular Services, [198] 953
County Courts, [198] 908
Dundrum Lunatic Asylum, [198] 912, 913
Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 927, 948
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1466
Excesses on Grants, [194] 773
Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1438
Land Registry Office, [198] 909
Learned Societies, [198] 505
[*cont.*

Muntz, Mr. P. H.—*cont.*
Probate Court, [198] 909
Tonnage Bounties, [198] 960
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 429; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 787

Murphy, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 33, [196] 61
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 202, 229; 2R. 582
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1528
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 816
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [194] 991, 995; Comm. Amendt. [196] 1451
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1489

Murphy's Lectures
The Mayor of Tynemouth—Act 39 *Geo. III.* c. 79, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 14, [195] 759
Mr. Murphy, the Protestant Lecturer, Arrest of, Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 17, [197] 124; Questions, Mr. Greene, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, Mr. Bruce *June* 22, 411; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 9, 1542
Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 23, To leave out from "That" and add "the right of free speech is one of the most important safeguards of good Government, and that attacks upon this right are, therefore, dangerous to the welfare of the State:—That the recent conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department in preventing free discussion of important topics was, in fact, an attack upon this great safeguard of freedom; and is, therefore, deserving of reprehension by this House:—That this conduct of the Secretary of State for the Home Department has proved especially mischievous, since it has led to breaches of the law on the part of official persons, more particularly by the Mayor of Birmingham, who caused the arrest of an innocent person for the purpose of preventing what to him was distasteful discussion" (*Mr. Newdegate*), [198] 592; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed; after further debate, Question put, and agreed to

Museums, &c., Opening of, on Sundays
Observations, Mr. W. H. Gregory *June* 4, [196] 1254; after debate, [House counted out]—*The Lord's Day Society and the Petition Forgeries,* Explanation, Mr. W. H. Gregory *June* 10, 1493; Explanation, Mr. T. Chambers *June* 16, 1916

Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Cardwell, The Judge Advocate*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 12
Read 2°* *Mar* 18
Committee*; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3°* *Mar* 22
[*cont.*

Mutiny Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl Granville*) *April* 5
Read 2ª* *April* 6
Committee*; Report *April* 8
Read 3ª* *April* 9
Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 4]

National Debt
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that steps should be taken gradually to reduce the National Debt" (*Mr. Lambert*) *August* 3, [198] 1211; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

National Gallery
Deterioration of Pictures in South Kensington Museum, Motion for Address for "Copy of the Report of the Committee appointed by the Science and Art Department to inquire into the alleged deterioration of the Pictures belonging to the National Gallery deposited at the South Kensington Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *June* 11, [196] 1635; Motion withdrawn
National Portrait Gallery—Hogarth's Portrait, Observations, Mr. Disraeli *July* 30, [198] 996 12th Report—(*Parl. P.* No. 189)
Purchases — The "Rembrandt," Questions, Lord De L'Isle and Dudley, The Earl of Winchilsea; Answers, Earl Granville, Lord Overstone; short debate thereon *July* 26, [198] 651
Moved to resolve, That henceforth it be an instruction to Mr. Boxall, R.A., to buy no picture in England without previously submitting it to the judgment of the Trustees of the National Gallery, or any picture in foreign parts which has not got an authentic pedigree from the date of its being painted by the master to whom it is ascribed to the day of purchase, unless by special permission in writing from the aforesaid Trustees (*The Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham*) *August* 3, [198] 1140; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Parl. Papers—
Report for 1868 . . . . . . (No. 3)
New National Gallery—Correspondence . . . . . (No. 88)

Naval Stores Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Camperdown*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 15 (No. 33)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 13, [195] 672; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee* *April* 15
Report* *April* 16 (No. 57)
Read 3ª* *April* 19
c. Read 1°* *April* 21 [Bill 88]
Read 2°* *April* 23
Committee*; Report *April* 26
Considered* *April* 28
Read 3°* *April* 29
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 12]

NAVY
Admiralty Accounts — Recommendations of Select Committee, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Childers *August* 10, [198] 1526
Admiralty — Third Class Clerks, Question, Captain Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Childers *Feb* 23, [194] 205
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 11, To leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, the members of the Civil Service are entitled to a scale of pay in accordance with the terms of any Order in Council which has not been revoked or qualified by a succeeding Order of equal authority" (*Captain Grosvenor*), [196] 1621; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 107, N. 64; M. 43; Question, Lord Henry Lennox; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 22, [197] 412
Clerks (Somerset House)—(*P. P.* No. 103)
African Squadron — Returns, Question, Observations, Mr. J. Lowther; Reply, Mr. Childers; short debate thereon *April* 2, [195] 41—*Force on West Coast*, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Childers *August* 10, [198] 1527
Armament of Turret-ships, Question, The Duke of Somerset; Answer, The Earl of Camperdown *April* 8, [195] 340; Explanation, The Earl of Camperdown *April* 12, 569
Australian Preserved Meats, Question, Mr. Lusk; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 2, [194] 487
Board of Admiralty, Constitution of the, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. Childers *Feb* 25, [194] 304
Channel and Mediterranean Fleets, Question, Captain Egerton; Answer, Mr. Childers *July* 27, [198] 797
Coal for the Navy, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Baxter *May* 28, [196] 879 Report of Trials—(*P. P.* No. 270)
Coal, North Country, Question, Mr. H. Vivian; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 22, [195] 1354
Coastguard, The, Question, Mr. Stewart Hardy; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 4, [194] 628
Coastguardmen in the Flying Squadron, Observations, Sir John Hay; Reply, Mr. Childers *June* 18, [197] 309; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Childers *July* 22, [198] 453
Contracts, Observations, Mr. Muntz *April* 2, [195] 51; Observations, Mr. Muntz; Reply, Mr. Baxter; short debate thereon *July* 23, [198] 633; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Baxter *July* 29, 897
Corruption in the Admiralty Departments, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Childers *August* 9, [198] 1489
"*Crocodile*" *Transport*, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *April* 20, [195] 1197
Dockyards
Government Dockyards, Reductions in, Observations, Sir James Elphinstone; Reply, Mr. Childers; short debate thereon *Feb* 26, [194] 374
Distress, Question, Sir J. Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 2, [195] 47

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

Emigration, Observations, Sir James Elphinstone; Reply, Mr. Cardwell *April* 16, [195] 991; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 27, [195] 1698; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 4, [196] 105; Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 7, 1297
Parl. Papers—
Dockyard Artizans (Canada) 196, 354, 403

Fresh Water for the Fleet, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Childers *July* 29, [198] 892

Greenwich Hospital
Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 5, [194] 717
Greenwich Hospital Fund—Merchant Seamen, Question, Mr. Armitstead; Answer, Mr. Childers *May* 13, [196] 745
Greenwich Sixpence, The—Mercantile Marine Fund, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 29, [195] 1853
(See *Supply*)
Parl Papers—
Estimates . . . . . . (No. 131, 364)
Papers . . . . (No. 207)
Accounts, 1867-8 . . . (No. 163)

Herne Bay Oyster Company and H.M.S. "Buzzard," Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answers, Mr. Bright, Mr. Childers *Mar* 1, [194] 407; Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Mr. Bright *Mar* 8, 838

"Inconstant," The, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Childers *May* 6, [196] 262

Lord High Admiral, Office of, Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 4, [194] 627

Malta—New Port and Docks, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 27, [195] 1695

Moorings in Dover Harbour, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 26, [195] 1353

Naval Chaplains, Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 18, [194] 1654

Naval Officers on Foreign Stations, Instructions to, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 15, [194] 1353

Pure Lime Juice, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Baxter *August* 5, [198] 1291

Reserve Channel Squadron—Coastguard and Naval Reserve Seamen, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 4, [196] 1236

Royal Naval Reserve, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 2, [194] 484

"Will-of-the-Wisp" Journal and the Admiralty, Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Mr. Childers *Feb* 23, [194] 208

Woolwich Dockyard—Mr. Barnes, Admiralty Pilot, Question, Mr. Mills; Answer, Mr. Childers *April* 15, [195] 842

NELSON, Earl
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1741
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1535
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 613; Comm. *cl.* 8, 1875
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1342
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 114; Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 921; *cl.* 25, 998; *cl.* 46, 1164
St. Katherine's Hospital, [195] 1945

NEVILLE-GRENVILLE, Mr. R., *Somersetshire, Mid.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1168
Army—Yeomanry Cavalry, [194] 158
Civil Service Estimates, [195] 27
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 22, [196] 853; *cl.* 26, 854
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 121; [197] 516
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1006
Income Tax, Payment of the, [195] 843
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 23, [195] 1529
Metropolis—Statues in Palace Yard, [196] 1742
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 926, 952
Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 966
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 660, 665
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 415; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), 612; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 807

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 501
Army—Committee on New Arms, [198] 497
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1038
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1280
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [194] 186, 487
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1748; *cl.* 41, 1782
Fenianism in Australia, [195] 30, 31
French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 346
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1739
Habitual Criminals, Comm. [198] 1267
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 762
Ireland—Fenian Conspiracy, [194] 1790
Maynooth College, [194] 1091; [195] 49, 51, 360
195] Irish Church, Comm. Amendt.* 848; *cl.* 10, 1104; *cl.* 12, 1117; *cl.* 18, 1413, 1414, 1476, 1478; *cl.* 25, 1595, 1597; *cl.* 27, 1645; *cl.* 29, 1886
196] *cl.* 37, 74; *cl.* 39, 113, 119, 121, 134, 137, 147, 283, 341; Consid. 763; 3R. 1069
197] Lords Amendts. 1916, 1941, 1942, 1964
198] 43, 44
Libel, 2R. Amendt. [194] 1604
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 263; [195] 980
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, [197] 411, 1542; *Res. [198] 592, 617, 621, 632, 633

[*cont.*

Newdegate, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
- O'Farrell Papers, The, [195] 1468, 1470, 1584 ; *1743, 1755, 1758, 1854, 2064 ; [196] 17
- O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 201 ; 2R. 579
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 84
  - Business of the House, [195] 1473, 1978 ; [198] 157
- Pharmacy Act Amendment, Comm. [195] 1933, 1934
- Poor Law (Removal of Children), Res. [197] 1340
- Public Houses, &c. Res. [197] 456
- Roman Catholic Charities, &c. Motion for a Committee, [194] *384 ; [195] 1362 ; *Motion for Returns, [198] 1014
- Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 512
- University Tests, 2R. [194] 1444, 1451, 1452 ; Comm. [197] 786 ; *add. cl.* 1095
- Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 585, 586
- Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 624

New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of York*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª* *May* 13 (No. 106)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 11, [196] 1582 ; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee* ; Report *June* 24 (No. 150)
Re-comm.* *July* 12
Report* *July* 13 (No. 184)
Read 3ª* *July* 15
c. Read 1º* *July* 20 [Bill 225]
Read 2º* *July* 26
Committee* ; Report *July* 29
Considered* *July* 30
Read 3º* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 94]

New Peers
- *Dec* 15, 1868—The Right Hon. Sir William Page Wood, Knight, Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, Baron Hatherley of Down-Hatherley in the county of Gloucester
  - William Ernest Baron Feversham Viscount Helmsley of Helmsley and Earl of Feversham of Ryedale in the North Riding of the county of York
- *Feb* 18, 1869—The Earl of Caithness, a Peer of Scotland, Baron Barrogill of the United Kingdom
- *Mar* 2—Edward Anthony John Viscount Gormanston, a Peer of Ireland, created Baron Gormanston of Whitewood in the county of Meath
- *April* 15—The Right Hon. Sir John Laird Mair Lawrence, baronet, G. C. B., G.C.S.I., Baron Lawrence of the Punjaub and of Grately in the county of Southampton

[*cont.*

New Peers—cont.
- *April* 23—The Right Hon. Sir James Plaisted Wilde, knight, Baron Penzance of Penzance in the county of Cornwall
- *July* 2 — Lord Rollo, Baron Dunning of the United Kingdom

Sat First
- *Dec* 10, 1868—James Bishop of Hereford
- *Dec* 15—The Earl of Abergavenny, after the death of his Father
  - The Lord Carysfort, after the death of his Father
- *Feb* 11, 1869—The Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe
- *Feb* 16—Archibald Campbell Archbishop of Canterbury
  - John Bishop of London
  - William Connor Bishop of Peterborough
  - Richard Chevenix Archbishop of Dublin
- *Feb* 18—The Lord Carleton, after the death of his Father
  - The Duke of Norfolk, after the death of his Father
- *April* 19—The Viscount Gough, after the death of his Father
- *April* 22—The Earl De La Warr, after the death of his Father
- *April* 26—The Lord Cloncurry, after the death of his Father
- *April* 30—The Earl Ferrers, after the death of his Father
- *May* 3—The Lord Meldrum, after the death of his Father
- *May* 7—The Earl of Ilchester, after the death of his Uncle
- *May* 10—The Lord Bishop of Tuam
- *May* 11—The Lord Wynford, after the death of his Father
- *May* 13—The Earl of Hillsborough, after the death of his Father
- *June* 14—The Marquess of Anglesey, after the death of his Father
  - The Earl of Radnor, after the death of his Father
  - The Lord Leconfield, after the death of his Father
  - The Lord Ross, after the death of his Brother
  - The Viscount Combermere, after the death of his Father
  - The Lord Fingall, after the death of his Father
- *June* 21—The Lord Hawke, after the death of his Brother
- *June* 22—The Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart, after the death of his Father
- *June* 28—The Lord Ashburton, after the death of his Father
- *July* 1—The Lord Stanley of Alderley, after the death of his Father

Representative Peers for Ireland
(Writs and Returns.)
- *Feb* 16—The Earl of Rosse, *v.* Henry Baron Farnham, deceased
- *July* 8—The Earl of Bantry, *v.* The Earl of Wicklow, deceased

Representative Peer for Scotland
(Writ and Return.)
- *July* 8—The Earl of Kellie ; Certificate read

New Writs Issued

Dec 15, 1868—*For* Greenwich, *v.* Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, First Commissioner of the Treasury

For Oxford City, *v.* Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, Secretary of State

For London University, *v.* Right Hon. Robert Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer

For Pontefract, *v.* Right Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, First Commissioner of the Admiralty

For Birmingham, *v.* Right Hon. John Bright, President of the Board of Trade

For London City, *v.* Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen, Commissioner of Poor Law

For Southwark, *v.* Right Hon. Austen Henry Layard, First Commissioner of Works

For Halifax, *v.* James Stansfeld, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Plymouth, *v.* Sir Robert Porrett Collier, knight, Attorney General

For Exeter, *v.* Sir John Duke Coleridge, knight, Solicitor General

For Bradford, *v.* Right Hon. William Edward Forster, Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education

For Ripon, *v.* Lord John Hay, Commissioner of the Admiralty

For Truro, *v.* Hon. John Cranch Walker Vivian, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Wareham, *v.* John Hales Montagu Calcraft, esquire, deceased

Dec 29—*For* Louth, *v.* Right Hon. Chichester Samuel Parkinson Fortescue, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

For Clare, *v.* Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, baronet, Judge Advocate General

For Kerry, *v.* Viscount Castlerosse, Vice Chamberlain of the Household

For Kildare, *v.* Right Hon. Otho Augustus FitzGerald, Comptroller of the Household

For Westmeath, *v.* Algernon William Fulke Greville, esquire, Groom in Waiting

For Mallow, *v.* Right Hon. Edward Sullivan, Attorney General for Ireland

For Wigtown District of Burghs, *v.* George Young, esquire, Solicitor General for Scotland

For Clackmannan and Kinross, *v.* William Patrick Adam, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Hawick District of Burghs, *v.* George Otto Trevelyan, esquire, Commissioner of the Admiralty

For Derbyshire (Southern Division), *v.* Sir Thomas Gresley, baronet, deceased

[*cont.*

New Writs Issued—cont.

During Recess

For Renfrew, *v.* Archibald Alexander Speirs, esquire, deceased

Feb 17, 1869—*For* London City, *v.* Charles Bell, esquire, deceased

Feb 18—*For* New Radnor, *v.* Richard Green Price, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds

Feb 19—*For* Wexford Borough, *v.* Richard Joseph Devereux, esquire, void Election

For Westbury, *v.* John Lewis Phipps, esquire, void Election

Mar 4—*For* Bradford, *v.* Henry William Ripley, esquire, void Election

For Bewdley, *v.* Sir Richard Atwood Glass, void Election

Mar 5—*For* Drogheda, *v.* Benjamin Whitworth, esquire, void Election

For Scarborough, *v.* Sir John Vanden Bempde Johnstone, baronet, deceased

Mar 17—*For* Dumfries County, *v.* Sir Sydney Hedley Waterlow, incapable of Sitting and Voting

Mar 22—*For* Hereford City, *v.* George Clive, esquire, and John William Shaw Wyllie, esquire, void Election

For Blackburn, *v.* William Henry Hornby, esquire, and Joseph Feilden, esquire, void Election

April 9—*For* Sussex (Western Division), *v.* The Hon. Henry Wyndham, called up to the House of Peers

April 16—*For* Brecknock Borough, *v.* Howel Gwyn, esquire, void Election

May 3—Bewdley Writ—Return amended—Hon. Augustus Henry Archibald Anson, *v.* John Cunliffe Pickersgill Cunliffe, unduly returned

May 5—*For* Liskeard, *v.* Sir Arthur William Buller, deceased

May 31—*For* Stafford Borough, *v.* Henry Davis Pochin, esquire, and Colonel Walter Meller, void Elections

June 9—*For* Nottingham Town, *v.* Sir Robert Juckes Clifton, baronet, deceased

July 30—*For* New Sarum, *v.* Edward William Terrick Hamilton, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds

August 3—*For* Antrim, *v.* Rear Admiral George Henry Seymour, C.B., deceased

August 9—*For* Caithness-shire, *v.* George Traill, esquire, Manor of Northstead

New Members Sworn

Dec 29, 1868—Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, *Greenwich*

Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, *Oxford City*

Right Hon. Austen Henry Layard, *Southwark*

Right Hon. Robert Lowe, *London University*

Right Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, *Pontefract*

Right Hon. William Edward Forster, *Bradford*

Lord John Hay, *Ripon*

Hon. John Cranch Walker Vivian, *Truro*

[*cont.*

New Members Sworn—cont.
- Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen, *London City*
- James Stansfeld, the younger, esquire, *Halifax*
- Right Hon. John Bright (being one of the people called Quakers, made the Affirmation required by Law), *Birmingham*
- *Feb* 16, 1869—Sir John Duke Coleridge, *Exeter*
  - William Patrick Adam, esquire, *Clackmannan and Kinross*
  - George Otto Trevelyan, esquire, *Hawick District of Burghs*
  - Right Hon. Lord Otho Augustus FitzGerald, *Kildare*
  - Viscount Castlerosse, *Kerry*
  - Sir Robert Porrett Collier, *Plymouth*
  - Right Hon. Henry Austin Bruce, *Renfrew*
  - George Young, esquire, *Wigtown District of Burghs*
  - Right Hon. Chichester Samuel Parkinson Fortescue, *Louth*
  - Right Hon. Edward Sullivan, *Mallow*
  - Right Hon. Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, baronet, *Clare*
  - Captain Algernon William Fulke Greville, *Westmeath*
  - Henry Wilmot, esquire, *Derby County (Southern Division)*
- *Feb* 23—Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, *London City*
- *Mar* 1—Marquess of Hartington, *New Radnor*
  - Charles Paul Phipps, esquire, *Westbury*
- *Mar* 9—Henry James, esquire, *Taunton*
- *Mar* 15—John Cunliffe Pickersgill Cunliffe, esquire, *Bewdley*
  - Edward Miall, esquire, *Bradford*
- *Mar* 16—Sir Harcourt Johnstone, baronet, *Scarborough*
  - Richard Joseph Devereux, esquire, *Wexford Borough*
- *Mar* 18—Thomas Whitworth, esquire, *Drogheda*
- *April* 2—Major George Gustavus Walker, *Dumfries County*
- *April* 5—Colonel Edward Clive, and Chandos Wren Hoskyns, esquire, *Hereford City*
- *April* 6—Henry Master Feilden, esquire, and Edward Kenworthy Hornby, esquire, *Blackburn*
- *April* 13—John Samuel Wanley Sawbridge Erle Drax, esquire, *Wareham*
- *April* 19—The Earl of March, *Sussex (Western Division)*
- *April* 27—Lord Hyde, *Brecknock Borough*
- *May* 13 — Montague John Guest, esquire, *Youghal*
- *May* 31 — Right Hon. Edward Horsman, *Liskeard*
- *June* 10—Hon. Reginald Arthur James Talbot, and Thomas Salt the younger, esquire, *Stafford Borough*
- *June* 17—Charles Seely, the younger, esquire, *Nottingham Town*

Newspapers, &c. Bill (*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1º * *April* 8 [Bill 66]
  - Read 2º * *April* 15
  - Committee *; Report *April* 22, [195] 1416
  - Considered * *April* 23
  - Read 3º * *April* 26
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *April* 27
  - Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 31, [196] 964; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 80)
  - Committee *; Report *June* 18 (No. 137)
  - Read 3ª * *June* 21
  - Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 24]

Newspapers—The Copyright Act—Delivery to the British Museum
- Questions, Sir John Gray, Mr. Baines; Answers, Mr. Ayrton *July* 23, [198] 559

New Zealand
- *Affairs of*, Observations, Viscount Bury; Reply, Mr. Monsell; long debate thereon *July* 22, [198] 456; Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Granville; debate thereon *July* 27, 778
- *The War*, Observations, Earl Granville *Feb* 26, [194] 332
- *Withdrawal of the Imperial Troops*, Question, Mr. Sartoris; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 13, [195] 675

Nicol, Mr. J. Dyce, *Kincardineshire*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 112, [197] 1765
- Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee, [196] 635
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), Leave, [194] 113
- India—Bank of Bombay, [194] 1186
- Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 527

Nitro Glycerine Bill (*Sir John Hay, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Mr. Graves*)
- *c.* Resolution in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1º * *July* 12 [Bill 211]
  - Read 2º * *July* 15
  - Committee *; Report *July* 22 [Bill 235]
  - Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 29
  - Considered * *July* 30
  - Read 3º * *July* 30
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *August* 2 (No. 245)
  - Read 2ª * *August* 3
  - Committee * *August* 5
  - Report * *August* 6 (No. 277)
  - Read 3ª * *August* 7
  - Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 113]

Noel, Hon. G. J., *Rutlandshire*
- Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1784

Norfolk Island Bishopric Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl Granville*)
- *l.* Presented; read 1ª * *April* 23 (No. 73)
  - Read 2ª * *April* 26
  - Committee *; Report *April* 27
  - Read 3ª * *April* 29

[*cont.*

Norfolk Island Bishopric Bill—cont.
c. Read 1° * *May* 3 [Bill 104]
Read 2° * *May* 6
Committee *; Report *May* 31
Read 3° * *June* 1
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 16]

North, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Army—Questions, &c.
Allowances to Troops in China and Japan, [194] 1463
Colonels in the Indian Army, [197] 1888, 1889
Crimean Prize Money, [197] 1669
Fines for Drunkenness, [196] 1295
Japan, Officers in, [198] 899, 902, 903, 905
Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 139
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1530
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1171
Martial Law, [195] 661, 663
Militia, &c. [196] 1574
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 121
Canada—Reduction of Forces, [196] 748
Contagious Diseases Act, Motion for a Committee, [196] 809
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [194] 1462
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [196] 1450

Northbrook, Lord (Under Secretary of State for War)
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1436, 1448, 1451, 1462
Army—School of Musketry at Hythe, Motion for Report, [197] 1594
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), [198] 1139
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 898 ; *cl.* 15, 920 ; *cl.* 33, 1155, 1156 ; Report, 1500 ; 3R. 1661
Militia, Comm. [195] 1847 ; 3R. [196] 94

Northcote, Right Hon. Sir S. H., *Devonshire, N.*
Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 635
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1424
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 499
Asia, Central, [197] 1577
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1112
Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company, [196] 1497
China—Communication with, [198] 1038
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1322
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 116 ; 2R. 1413 ; Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, [196] 1762 ; *cl.* 41, 1781
Exeter, Trade of, [196] 1741
India—Questions, &c.
Auditor General of Accounts, [197] 357
Bhore Ghaut, Railway Accident at, [194] 485
Fisheries, [197] 357
Home Accounts, [197] 118
Muscat and Zanzibar, [195] 1580
Mysore, Maharajah of, [196] 1495
Native Scholarships, [194] 310
Opium Trade, [198] 449
Railways, [198] 1091
Revenues of, [196] 16
India—East India (Home Accounts), Motion for Papers, [197] 1329 [*cont.*

Northcote, Rt. Hon. Sir S. H.—*cont.*
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Res. [198] 1184
Ireland—Established Church—Value of Endowments, [194] 839
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1862, 2126 ; Comm. *cl.* 10, [195] 1107 ; *cl.* 13, 1125 ; *cl.* 14, 1371 ; *cl.* 18, 1480 ; *cl.* 25, 1608 ; *cl.* 27, 1631 ; *cl.* 32, [196] 24 ; *cl.* 39, 334, 337 ; [198] 36
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Comm. *add. cl.* [198] 1057
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 233
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 171
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 632 ; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 798

Northumberland, Duke of
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1448
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 33, [197] 1156
Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 984
Militia, 3R. [196] 99
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [196] 79 ; *cl.* 4, 80 ; *add. cl.* 81

Norwich Election—Joint Address for a Commission
Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 12 ; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to ; Message to the Lords thereon *April* 1, [195] 2
l. Address agreed to *June* 8
Her Majesty's Answer reported *June* 21

Norwood, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Assessed Rates, [194] 628 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [197] 385
Bankruptcy, Leave, [194] 788 ; 2R. [195] 142
196] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1212 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1213 ; *cl.* 7, 1218 ; *cl.* 8, 1219 ; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 1403 ; *cl.* 46, 1414, 1416 ; *cl.* 54, 1595 ; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 1597, 1605 ; *cl.* 126, 1902
197] *cl.* 131, 416 ; *add. cl.* Amendt. 419, 420
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1025
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Leave, [194] 680
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1561, 1572 ; [196] 684, 687
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 839
Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 974
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 173 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 429 ; *cl.* 5, 573
Judicature Commission, [196] 1633
Light Dues, Res. [196] 184
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1938
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 424 ; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), 622

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Army Estimates—Military Stores, [195] 669
Army—Horse Guards and the War Office, [194] 1107
Military Appointments, [194] 354
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1180
India—Civil Service Examinations, [194] 841
Ireland—Clerk of the Crown for King's County, [197] 1421

O'Brien, Sir P.—*cont.*
Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [198] 1209
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 12, [195] 1120; Lords Amendts. [198] 580
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 88
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co., [197] 983, 984
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1928
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, Amendt. [194] 645; Motion for reporting Progress, 646, 648
  Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1464, 1467
  Foreign Office, [197] 1677
  Office of Woods, &c. Amendt. [197] 1704, 1705
  Royal Parks, &c. [197] 667, 668

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
Ireland — Fenian Convicts, Pardon of, [194] 159
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 18, [195] 1486; *cl.* 27, 1872; *cl.* 39, [196] 136, 142

O'Donoghue, The, *Tralee*
Ireland—State of, [195] 2035
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2048; Lords Amendts. [198] 62
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 576
Party Processions (Ireland), Leave, [194] 122; 2R. 1551

Œcumenical Council—The German Governments
Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 19, [198] 151

O'Farrell Papers—(See *Australian Legislative Assembly*)

Offices Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 29 [Bill 246]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 3

Ogilvy, Sir J., *Dundee*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 397
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [198] 1101, 1110

O'Loghlen, Right Hon. Sir C. M. (Judge Advocate General), *Clare Co.*
Army—Branding in the, [195] 574

O'Neill, Lord
Irish Church, Report, [197] 1489

O'Neill, Hon. E., *Antrim Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1377; Consid. Amendt. [196] 770

Onslow, Mr. G., *Guildford*
Malta—New Port and Docks, [195] 1695
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [197] 685

Order of St. Michael and St. George
Question, Mr. Raikes; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 15, [194] 1348

Order of St. Patrick
Question, The Earl of Portarlington; Answer, Earl Spencer *July* 5, [197] 1106

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 139
  Drilling at Aldershot, [198] 156
Army Estimates—Army Administration, [197] 143, 147
  Land Forces, [194] 1157
India—Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, [195] 1580
  Military Appointments, [194] 1654
Ireland—Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, [195] 506
  Tralee Gaol, [196] 1629
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1270, 1273
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 27, [195] 1868; Lords Amendts. [198] 78
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1301, 1315
O'Sullivan's Disability, 2R. [196] 583
Parliament—Business of the House, [195] 847
  Dublin City Election, [194] 832, 1543
  Dublin City Writ, [196] 1786, 1791
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [194] 989; Comm. [196] 1456

O'Reilly-Dease, Mr. M., *Louth Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1534
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1327
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1284
Ireland—Irish Society, The, Motion for a Commission, [195] 726
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 900; *cl.* 20, 1499; *cl.* 36, [196] 71; *add. cl.* 423
Irish Church—Organists, [195] 1197
Malta, Res. [197] 1776
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. [198] 360
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 811
Supply—Stationery Office, [197] 1695

Oriel College, Oxford, Bill
l. Bill read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 8, [194] 800

O'Sullivan's Disability Bill
Banquet at Cork—Speeches of the Mayor, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 18, [194] 1661
Expenses of Counsel, &c., Moved, "That there be laid before this House Returns, stating the total amount of the expenses incurred by Her Majesty's Government for the payment of Counsel, and for the attendance of Witnesses and other persons on the occasion of the different stages of the Bill for disabling Mr. Daniel O'Sullivan from holding the office of Mayor of Cork, or any other office or dignity in Ireland:

[*cont.*

O'Sullivan's Disability Bill—cont.

And, stating from what particular source such expenses are to be defrayed" (*Sir Percy Burrell*) *May* 13, [196] 809; Motion withdrawn

Fenian Convicts—Pardon of, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 23, [194] 1997

Mayor of Cork, The, Question postponed, Mr. Dawson *May* 3, [196] 13; Questions, The Earl of Stradbroke, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answers, Earl Granville *May* 4, 76; Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland, 102

Meeting in Cork — Party Processions Act, Question, Colonel Forde; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *May* 11, [196] 573

Municipal Magistrates, Removal of, Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 11, [196] 572; Question, Earl Grey; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *June* 1, 1085

O'Sullivan's Disability Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*)

c. Orders of the Day postponed (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 5, [196] 185

196] Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *May* 5, 186

After long debate, Bill to disable Daniel O'Sullivan, esquire, from holding, enjoying, or taking the Office of Mayor, or Justice of the Peace, or any office or place of magistracy in the City of Cork or elsewhere in Ireland; ordered; read 1° * [Bill 108]

Ordered, That a Copy of the said Bill, and of the said Order for the Second Reading thereof, be forthwith served upon Daniel O'Sullivan, esquire, Mayor of the City of Cork

Ordered, That Mr. Attorney General for Ireland do take care that evidence be produced in support of the said Bill, upon the Second Reading thereof

Ordered, That James Sheridan M'Leod and others [who are named] do attend this House on Tuesday the 11th day of this instant May, at Two of the clock, and give evidence on the Bill to disable Daniel O'Sullivan, esquire, from holding, enjoying, or taking the office of Mayor, or Justice of the Peace, or any office or place or magistracy in the city of Cork or elsewhere in Ireland, and produce all Documents relating to the same

. Ordered, That Mr. Attorney General for Ireland do appoint Counsel to produce and manage the evidence, at the Bar of this House, upon Tuesday the 11th day of this instant May, in support of the allegations of O'Sullivan's Disability Bill (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *May* 6, 350

. Orders for 2R. and for Counsel and Witnesses to attend, read *May* 11, 575

Moved, "That Counsel be now called in" (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Order for attendance of Counsel and Witnesses discharged; 2R. deferred

Bill withdrawn * *June* 8

OTWAY, Mr. A. J. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Chatham*

Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1436
Army—British Graves in the Crimea, [196] 17, 747
Army Estimates—Martial Law, [195] 664, 665
Austria—Commercial Treaty with, [196] 970
Canada—Boundaries, [198] 1441
China—Hostilities to Foreigners, [195] 578
  Pekin, Affair at, [197] 625
  Relations with, [195] 1855
  Tien-tsin, Treaty of, Motion for Papers, [197] 1798
Cuba—Capture of an American Ship in British Colonial Waters, [196] 106, 264
  Imprisonment of a British Subject, [194] 159
Diplomatic Pensions, [196] 1589
Egypt—Suez Canal, [197] 1664; [198] 1087
  Viceroy of, [196] 1205
Extradition, Law of, [194] 1462
Foreign Office—Agencies, [198] 1534
  Bidwell and Murray, Messrs., [194] 1083
  Unpaid Attachés, [197] 1675
Hayti—Civil War in, [194] 837
Italy—Nathan, Mr., Arrest of, [198] 1526
Jews in Roumania, [197] 1525
Levant—British Subjects in the, [198] 1250
Mexico—Bondholders, [198] 897
  Diplomatic Relations with, [195] 845; [197] 119
Œcumenical Council, The, [198] 151
Paraguay—British Subjects in, [198] 1248
Portugal — Cassells, Mr., Case of, [194] 126, 127
  Claims on the Government, [196] 1244
Shipping Dues in Foreign Ports, [198] 682
Société Industrielle et Agricole d'Egypte, [197] 1167; [198] 451
South Sea Islanders, Traffic in, [198] 450
Spain—Questions, &c.
  Imprisonment of a British Subject at Barcelona, [196] 1742
  "Mermaid," Case of the, [194] 1659
  "Tornado," Case of the, [194] 836; [196] 743, 1499
  Treaty of Commerce, [197] 1425
Supply—Consular Services, [198] 952, 953, 954
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 937, 938, 941, 948, 950, 951, 952
  Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1467
  Foreign Office, [197] 1677, 1679
  Public Buildings, [197] 675
  Tonnage Bounties, [198] 961
Turkey — Cretan Insurgents, [195] 1099; [198] 19
United States — "Alabama" Claims, [194] 309
  Chicago—Consulate at, [198] 1294
  San Juan, Island of, [198] 1249
  Speer, Captain, Murder of, [196] 1498

Outlawries Bill

c. Read 1° * *Feb* 16

OVERSTONE, Lord

Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1874
National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 653
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 958

Oxford, Bishop of
Brazilian Slave Trade, 2R. [194] 477
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations, 2R. [195] 1820
Irish Church, [197] 354; Comm. Preamble, 713; *cl.* 2, 751; *cl.* 28, 1074; *cl.* 69, Amendt. 1260, 1261
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 11
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 80

Oxford University Statutes Bill
(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Mowbray*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *May* 28 [Bill 136]
Read 2º* *June* 1
Committee*; Report *June* 3
Read 3º* *June* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Derby*) *June* 4 (No. 114)
Read 2ª* *June* 8
Committee*; Report *June* 11
Read 3ª* *June* 14
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 20]

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *April* 13 [Bill 76]
Read 2º* *April* 19, and referred to a Select Committee
Report* *June* 4
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 10
Read 3º* *June* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 14 (No. 129)
Read 2ª* *June* 17
Committee*; Report *June* 24
Read 3ª* *June* 25
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 70]

Oyster Dredging
Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Bright *July* 12, [197] 1667

Oyster Fishery
Colchester—The Colne Fishery, Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 9, [198] 1493

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J. S., *Droitwich*
Army—Courts Martial, [198] 324
Horse Guards and the War Office, [194] 1109
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1567
Army Estimates—Army Administration, [197] 146
Land Forces, [194] 1139, 1140, 1145
Military Education, [197] 143
Military Stores, [195] 669
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1247
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 127, 148; *cl.* 59, 399
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 926, 929
Salaries, [195] 76
Steam Machinery, [195] 202
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 665
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 986
Supply—Greenwich Hospital, [196] 1577

Palk, Sir L., *Devonshire, S.*
Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 561
Cadastral Survey, [194] 1999
Ireland—Church Leaseholds, [195] 1096
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 25, [195] 1612
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 109
Dublin City Writ, [197] 133
Parliamentary Disqualification, [197] 351
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 967

Palmer, Sir R., *Richmond*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1215, 1216; *cl.* 7, 1218; *cl.* 14, 1222, 1224; *cl.* 59, 1598, 1601; *cl.* 91, 1607; *cl.* 126, 1902; *cl.* 129, 1906, 1907; *cl.* 130, 1908; [197] 315, 328
Courts of Justice, New, Res. Amendt. [195] 1216, 1269
Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 549
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 764, 767
194] Irish Church, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1894, * 1906, 2121
195] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1011, 1022; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1106, 1108; *cl.* 13, 1125, 1126; *cl.* 14, 1139; Amendt. 1365, 1367, 1377, 1380, 1381; Amendt. 1383, 1385, 1401; *cl.* 23, 1525; *cl.* 25, 1600; *cl.* 27, 1632, 1880; *cl.* 29, 1886, 1910
196] *cl.* 3, 422; *add. cl.* 425, 426; Consid. *add. cl.* 758, 766, 768, 771
197] Lords Amendts. 1935, 1964, 1973, 1979
198] 41, 574
Law Courts, New, Motion for a Committee, [197] 461
Marriage Laws, [198] 1395
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 667
New Writs, [194] 18
Patents for Inventions, [196] 892
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 772; Consid. 976
University Tests, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [194] 1054, 1416, 1428; Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 794; *add. cl.* 1090, 1098, 1099

Palmer, Mr. J. Hinde, *Lincoln City*
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 164; Comm. *cl.* 7, [196] 1218; *cl.* 54, 1596; *cl.* 59, 1604; *cl.* 88, 1606; *cl.* 91, 1899; *cl.* 126, 1903; *cl.* 131, [197] 416; *add. cl.* 418
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 19, [196] 1770
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1385
Law Courts, New, Motion for a Committee, [197] 462
Marriage Laws, [198] 1407
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Consid. [198] 1134
Railways—Communication between Passengers and Guards, [195] 29; [196] 1243
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1858
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1031
Statute Law, Revision of the, Res. [196] 1252

Paraguay, British Subjects in
Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 4, [198] 1248

Parker, Mr. C. S., *Perthshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Conveyance of Cattle, [198] 1491;—Slaughter of Cattle, 1492
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. [197] 159
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, Amendt. [196] 1777
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], 2R. [197] 505
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 1110; *cl.* 24, 1243; Consid. 1462

Park Gate Chapel Marriages, &c. Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Archbishop of York*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 19 (No. 59)
Read 2ª* *April* 29
Committee*; Report *April* 30
Read 3ª* *May* 3
c. Read 1º* *May* 6 [Bill 111]
Read 2º* *June* 8
Committee*; Report *June* 11
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 21
Committee*; Report *June* 24
Considered* *June* 25
Read 3º* *June* 28
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 30]

Parliament

Her Majesty's Proclamation for dissolving the present Parliament, and declaring the calling of another, dated Nov. 11, 1868

Her Majesty's Proclamation in Order to the Electing and Summoning the Sixteen Peers of Scotland, dated Nov. 11, 1868

List of the Ministry (Mr. Disraeli's)
List of the Ministry (Mr. Gladstone's)
Roll of the Lords in the First Session of the Twentieth Parliament of the United Kingdom
List of Members Returned from the respective Counties, Cities, Towns, and Boroughs, to serve in the Twentieth Parliament of the United Kingdom

LORDS—

Meeting of the New Parliament—The Parliament opened by Commission *Dec* 10, [194] 1
Speaker of the House of Commons presented and approved *Dec* 11, [194] 11
A Speech of the Lords Commissioners *Dec* 15, [194] 14

House adjourned to Thursday Feb. 11

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech delivered by The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 16,
194] 23

. An Address to Her Majesty thereon moved by The Earl of Carysfort (the Motion being seconded by The Lord Monck), and, after short debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente* *Feb* 16, 27
. Address to be presented to Her Majesty by the Whole House *Feb* 18, 104
. Order [*Feb* 18] discharged; Address to be presented by the Lords with White Staves *Feb* 22, 153
. Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 25, 283

[*cont.*

Parliament—Lords—*cont.*

194] *Public Business*, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *Feb* 18, 95
Chairman of Committees—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 16
Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 16
Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Feb* 16
Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 16
Receivers and Tryers of Petitions—appointed *Feb* 16
. *Chairman of Committees*—Observations, Lord Redesdale *Feb* 25, 284
. *Easter Recess*—Question, Lord Cairns; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 8, 798
House adjourned on Friday, March 19, to Monday, April 5
Whitsuntide Recess, House adjourned on Thursday, May 13, to Monday the 31st Instant

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—Select Committee appointed *Feb* 22, as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Richmond, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Tankerville, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Granville, Ld. Chamberlain, V. Hawarden, V. Eversley, Ld. Steward, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Cairns
Report considered and agreed to *August* 10, [198] 1524

Business of the House
Bankruptcy Bill, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short de-
194] bate thereon *Feb* 18, 95
. *Bills relating to Ireland*—Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 23, 198
. *Despatch of Business in Parliament—Joint Committee*—Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any facilities can be given for the despatch of business in Parliament, especially in regard to the relations of the two Houses" (*The Earl Granville*) *Mar* 15, 1309; Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed and nominated as follows:—M. Salisbury, E. Derby, E. Granville, V. Eversley, V. Halifax, L. Redesdale
Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith
. Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Select Committee of six Members to join with the Select Committee appointed by this House *Mar* 18, 1618
. Message from the Commons [March 18]; Select Committee to meet forthwith *Mar* 18, 1787
Houses of Parliament—Construction of the House, Resolution respecting the re-arrangement of the House of Lords (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *July* 16, [198] 4; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Irish Church Bill—Observations, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *July* 16, [198] 14

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Order in the House, Observations, Lord Romilly; Reply, Earl Granville; debate thereon *June* 22, [197] 400; Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *July* 19, [198] 148

Privilege—Representative Peers for Scotland—Double Return, Petition of the Earl of Kellie, claiming also to be Earl of Mar; and of the Right Hon. John Francis Erskine Goodeve Erskine Earl of Mar, Baron Garioch: Report of Committee for Privileges *May* 11, [196] 561; after short debate, Report read, and agreed to (No. 99)

Private Bills

194] Ordered, That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill after Monday the 22nd of March next [and other Orders] *Feb* 25, 300

. Standing Order Committee on, appointed; List of the Committee *Feb* 26, 351

. All petitions relating to Standing Orders which shall be presented during the present Session referred to the Standing Order Committee, unless otherwise ordered, 351

. *Opposed Private Bills,* Committee appointed and nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 26, 351

. Ordered, "That the time limited by the order of the 25th of February last for the reception of petitions for Private Bills be extended to the first sitting day after the recess at Easter" (*The Chairman of Committees*) *Mar* 11, 1054

. Standing Order No. 179. Secs. 1 and 2 suspended; and the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House, extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess at Easter *Mar* 18, 1618

195] No Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 15th day of June next; [and other Orders] *April* 8, 338

Railway Bills—31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 119, sec. 35, Resolutions, [194] 123

Railway Bills — Standing Order No. 185, Ordered, That in all cases in which Railway Bills of this Session shall (in accordance with the provisions of the Act 31st and 32d Victoria, cap. 119) have been submitted to a meeting of the proprietors of any company in respect of additional powers conferred on such company, and shall have been approved at such meeting, it shall not be necessary to submit the Bill to a meeting of such company to be held in accordance with Standing Order No. 185, unless any of the powers specified in such Order shall have been inserted or materially altered in the House of Commons" (*The Chairman of Committees*) *April* 16, [195] 942

COMMONS—

MEETING OF THE NEW PARLIAMENT *Dec* 10

The House went up to the House of Peers:—and being returned—

Choice of a Speaker—The Right Honourable John Evelyn Denison unanimously called to the Chair

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Mr. SPEAKER ELECT, with the House, went up to the House of Peers, where he was presented to the Lords Commissioners for Her Majesty's approbation. Being returned—

Mr. SPEAKER reported Her Majesty's Approval, and took the Oath, with other Members *Dec* 11

194] THE QUEEN'S SPEECH reported; Resolution for an humble ADDRESS thereon moved by Mr. H. COWPER (the Motion being seconded by Mr. MUNDELLA) *Feb* 16, 52; after debate, Motion agreed to; and a Committee appointed to draw up the said Address

. Report of Address brought up, and agreed to; to be presented by the Whole House *Feb* 18, 106

. Order discharged (*Mr. Gladstone*); Address to be presented by Privy Councillors *Feb* 22, 164

. HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Feb* 25, 308

. *Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms* (*House of Commons*)—Standing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 17, 94

. *Printing* — Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 18, 123

. *Public Petitions*—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 19, 152

. *Selection*—Committee of Selection nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 23, 279

. *Public Accounts*—Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Mar* 1, 470

Business of the House

. *University Tests Bill,* Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Gladstone; short debate thereon *Mar* 11, 1092

. *Despatch of Business in Parliament—Joint Committee,* Observations, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 15, 1459

Message from the Lords *Mar* 15

. Lords Message considered *Mar* 16, 1560

Moved, "That a Select Committee of Six Members be appointed to join with the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of Monday 15th March, to consider whether any facilities can be given for the Despatch of Business in Parliament, especially in regard to the relations of the two Houses" (*Mr. Gladstone*); Motion agreed to

The Select Committee appointed as follows:—Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Dodson, Sir George Grey, Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Walpole

Message to the Lords

Message from the Lords

. Lords Message considered *Mar* 18, 1759; Orders made thereon

Easter Recess, Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 22, 157; Observations, Mr. Ayrton *Mar* 3, 556; Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 9, 955

House adjourned from Tuesday *Mar* 23 to Thursday *April* 1

195] *Irish Church Bill,* Observations, Mr. Gladstone *April* 15, 846; *April* 23, 1470—*Morning Sitting,* Notice, Mr. Gladstone *April* 29, 1856

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Morning Sittings, Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 30, [195] 1975

Resolutions moved (*Mr. Gladstone*) and agreed to; Observations, Mr. Bentinck; Reply, Mr. Gladstone; short debate thereon *July* 5, [197] 1184

The Civil Service Estimates, Questions, Mr. Newdegate, Colonel French; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *July* 19, [198] 157

Whitsuntide Recess, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 3, [196] 21; Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 4, 104; Question Mr. Dent; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 585

House adjourned on Thursday *May* 13 to Thursday *May* 27

Privilege and Order

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 16

Standing Orders—Select Committee nominated *Feb* 23, as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Henley, Mr. Charles Howard, Mr. Lefroy, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Scourfield, and Mr. Whitbread

Private Business—Railway Bills, Resolutions (*Mr. Dodson*) *Feb* 18, [194] 105; after short debate, agreed to

Language used in Debate in the other House, Question, Mr. Milbank; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 21, [198] 368

Parliamentary Returns, Question, Mr. Peek; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 15, [197] 1887

Police Constables, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 12, [197] 1663

Rules of Debate—University Tests Bill, Questions, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answers, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 16, [194] 1467

Disability of the Episcopal Clergy to sit in Parliament, Question, Lord Henry Thynne; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 23, [195] 1466

Parliamentary Disqualification—Treasury Allowance on Abolition of Office, Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 21, [197] 351

Witnesses (*House of Commons*), Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to consider the best means of providing for the examination of Witnesses upon Oath by the House of Commons, and its Committees" (*Mr. Torrens*) *May* 11, [196] 620; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into the expediency of adopting any further measures for the examination of Witnesses upon Oath by this House, and by its Committees" (*Mr. Torrens*), 627

And, on *June* 8, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens (Chairman), The Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Disraeli, Sir John Esmonde, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Henley, Mr. Howes, Mr. Serjeant Kinglake, Colonel Wilson Patten, and Mr. S. H. Walpole

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Private Bills

Standing Order No. 179. sect. 1. suspended; and the time for depositing Petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House, extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess at Whitsuntide *May* 13, [196] 688

New Standing Order to follow Standing Order 70, agreed to

Standing Order 70 read, and repealed; and New Standing Order in lieu thereof, agreed to

Standing Order 77 read and amended

Ordered, "That the said Orders be Standing Orders of this House" (*Mr. Dodson*) *August* 9, [198] 1485

Palace of Westminster

House of Commons Arrangements, Moved, "That this House, agreeing in substance with the Report of the Select Committee of the year 1868 concerning House of Commons Arrangements, recommends the same for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Headlam*) *April* 6, [195] 258

After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "agreeing in substance with," and insert "refers" (*Viscount Bury*), 278; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after further debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 23, 1467

Insufficient Accommodation of the House, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "before granting the sums required for the maintenance and repair of the present Houses of Parliament, this House deems it right to state its opinion that the present accommodation for Members is not sufficient" (*Mr. Headlam*), [197] 962; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Ladies' Galleries, The, Question, Mr. H. A. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 17, [197] 120

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the grating in front of the Ladies' Gallery should be removed" (*Mr. Herbert*), 1582; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Question, Mr. H. A. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 16, [198] 20

Reporters' Gallery, Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 29, [198] 898

Mosaics in the Central Hall, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 22, [198] 448

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances under which a contract or agreement was made by the Office of Works with the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) for the decoration of the Central Hall of the Palace of Westminster" (*Mr. Raikes*), 708; Question,

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*
proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Plans for New Dining Rooms, &c., Select Committee appointed, "to consider Plans for New Refreshment and Dining Rooms for both Houses of Parliament, and for Improvements in the Ladies' Gallery of the House of Commons"
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Layard (Chairman), Mr. Bouverie, Colonel French, Colonel Wilson Patten, and Mr. William Henry Smith *July* 30, [198] 1054
Crypt under St. Stephen's Chapel, Question, Mr. W. Egerton; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 13, [195] 676; Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 13, [196] 744
Statues in Palace Yard, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 14, [196] 1742

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Thursday the 28th December *August* 11; Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech, [198] 1537

Parliamentary and Municipal Elections
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the present modes of conducting Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, in order to provide further guarantees for their tranquillity, purity, and freedom" (*Mr. Secretary Bruce*) *Mar* 4, [194] 648; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Nomination Days, Question, Mr. Brydges Willyams; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 9, [194] 952
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee to take into consideration the various methods of taking Votes by Ballot which are at present in use in portions of the British Empire and in other Countries, together with any modifications thereof which may be suggested, and to report upon the most efficient and convenient system of Balloting" (*Mr. Leatham*) *Mar* 16, 1470; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That the Select Committee consist of twenty-one Members" (*Mr. Bruce*) *Mar* 16, 1546; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Committee nominated as follows:—Marquess of Hartington (Chairman), Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Brand, Mr. J. Bright, Mr. Cross, Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Graves, Sir George Grey, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Sir Frederick Heygate, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Howes, Mr. Hunt, Mr. James, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Locke, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Raikes, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Villiers, and Mr. Whitbread
Report of Select Committee *July* 23 (*Parl. P.* No. 352)

Parliamentary Proceedings Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Salisbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 22 (No. 7)
Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 4, [194] 588
Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answer, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *Mar* 8, 799

Parochial Schoolmasters (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Fordyce*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *April* 12 [Bill 72]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 28

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill—Petitions
Observations, The Duke of Marlborough; Reply, The Duke of Argyll; short debate thereon *April* 12, [195] 567; Amendments, Question, Observations, The Duke of Richmond, Lord Cairns; Reply, The Duke of Argyll *April* 26, 1574

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill (*Lords*)
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
194] *l.* Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 25, 284
. Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 18, 1759 (No. 11)
196] Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *May* 10, 429; after debate, Committee (No. 96)
. Report *June* 7, 1281; after debate, Amendments made (No. 119)
Read 3ª* *June* 11
c. Read 1º* *June* 16 [Bill 164]
197] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *July* 12, 1711; after short debate, Bill read 2º
Committee*; Report *July* 13 [Bill 215]
198] Committee (*on re-comm.*) deferred *July* 19, 234
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 27, 817
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *August* 2, 1095
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *August* 3, 1229
. Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *August* 6, 1374
. Committee (*on re-comm*); Report *August* 6, 1442
. Considered *August* 7, 1452 [Bill 265]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3º" (*The Lord Advocate*) *August* 9, 1495
Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, in respect of an Amendment to Schedule (A)" (*Lord Elcho*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House;" after further short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Order for 3R. discharged; Bill re-committed in respect of Clauses 13, 16, 21, 23, 28, 65, and the Schedule (*The Lord Advocate*); Committee; Report, with Amendments; Considered
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3º;" after further short debate, Bill read 3º, and passed, with Amendments
. Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, The Lord Advocate *August* 10, 1534

. *l.* Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, Earl Granville *August* 7, 1451
. Bill returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments *August* 9, 1470 (No. 296)
Moved, "That the Commons Amendts. be considered To-morrow" (*The Duke of Argyll*)
Amendt. to leave out ("To-morrow,") and insert ("this day three months") (*The Lord Redesdale*); after debate, on Question,

[*cont.*

Parochial Schools (Scotland) Bill—cont.

198] That ("To-morrow") &c.? Cont. 43, Not-Cont. 55; M. 12; resolved in the negative, and Amendments to be considered this day three months
. Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 1483
. Moved, "That this Bill, as amended by the Commons, be reprinted" (*The Lord Redesdale*) *August* 10, 1524; Motion agreed to

Party Processions (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Johnston, The O'Donoghue*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. W. Johnston*) *Feb* 18, [194] 122; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 6]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 16, 1547; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Stacpoole*); A. 113, N. 70; M. 43; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 30, [197] 864; after debate, Debate further adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *July* 16

Patent Laws
Question, Mr. James Howard; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 26, [194] 356
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the interests of trade and commerce, and the progress of the arts and sciences in this Country, would be promoted by the abolition of Patents for Inventions" (*Mr. Macfie*), [196] 888; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Patent Office
Edmunds' Scandal, The, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *May* 10, [196] 469

Patten, Right Hon. Colonel J. W., *Lancashire, N.*
Army Estimates—Martial Law, [195] 664, 665
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1552
County Financial Boards, Leave, [196] 611
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), Comm. [195] 221
Ireland—Rates on Disturbed Districts, [196] 20, 21
  Wetherall, Sir E. R., Appointment of, [194] 751, 753, 754, 755, 756
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1169
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 13, [195] 1125; Lords Amendts. [197] 1961; [198] 28
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 217; 2R. 581
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [197] 868
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1545
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1487
Supply—House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476

Pease, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
Coal Fields, Motion for an Address, [196] 1910
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1532
Game Laws (Scotland), Nomination of Committee; Motion for Adjournment, [196] 632
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 127

[*cont.*

Pease, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. Amendt. [194] 542; Consid. *add. cl.* [196] 735, 739
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [194] 717
Rateable Property, Leave, [194] 185
Revenue Officers, 2R. Amendt. [194] 1576
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [197] 680

Peek, Mr. H. W., *Surrey, Mid.*
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 165, 166; Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1216; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1219; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1221; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1414; *cl.* 53, Amendt. 1418; Amendt. 1592; *cl.* 126, 1904, 1905; *cl.* 127, 1906
False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 736
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 427
Metropolis—Battersea Park, [195] 843
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [197] 1187
Parliamentary Returns, [197] 1887
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [197] 1482

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1625, 1626
Parliament — Morning Sittings, [195] 1979, 1980

Peel, Mr. A. W. (Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners), *Warwick Bo.*
Assessed Rates, Consid. *add. cl.* [197] 1083
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1777
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 491

Pell, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [195] 753
Agriculture, Department of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 500
Betten's Charity, [197] 356
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 444; Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1282; *cl.* 54, 1529; *cl.* 63, 1532; *cl.* 73, 1540; *add. cl.* 1773
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 59, [196] 416
Metropolitan Cattle Market, [196] 15
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 518

Pemberton, Mr. E. L., *Kent, E.*
Herne Bay Oyster Company, [194] 407, 838
Ireland—Maynooth College, [195] 361
  Seizure of Fishing Smacks, [197] 949
Metropolis—Courts of Justice, New, [196] 14

Pensions Commutation Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stansfeld*)

c. Resolutions in Committee *June* 28
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *June* 29 [Bill 187]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee*; Report *July* 6
Considered* *July* 7
Read 3°* *July* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *July* 9
Read 2ª* *July* 15 (No. 138)
Committee*; Report *July* 16
Read 3ª* *July* 19
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 32]

PENZANCE, Lord
- Bankruptcy, Comm. [198] 678
- Evidence Amendment, 2R. [198] 670, 678; Comm. *cl.* 1, 988; *cl.* 2, *ib.*
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1837; Comm. *cl.* 7, [197] 755; Amendt. 758; 3R. 1617
- Life Peerages, Comm. [196] 1185
- Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 979
- Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), Comm. [198] 1075

Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill *formerly* **Sale of Liquors Bill**
(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Dalway*)
- *c.* Acts read; considered in Committee; a Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 10]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 12, [196] 637
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Colonel Jervis*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 87, N. 193; M. 106; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

PETERBOROUGH, Bishop of
- Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 14
- China—Missionaries in, [194] 942
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1853; [197] 206; Comm. *cl.* 7, 757; *cl.* 12, 870; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 886, 891, 907, 917; *cl.* 26, 1000; *cl.* 29, 1120; Report, 1500, 1502

Petroleum Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 131]
- Read 2° * *June* 10
- Committee *; Report *July* 5 [Bill 194]
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Pharmacy Act (1868) Amendment Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
- *c.* Act read; considered in Committee; a Resolution agreed to *Mar* 4, [194] 683; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 37]
- Read 2° * *April* 12
- Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 29, [195] 1933
- Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Dr. Brewer*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Committee; Report [Bill 99]
- Considered * *May* 10
- Read 3° * *May* 13
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl Granville*) *May* 31 (No. 108)
- Read 2ª * *July* 27
- Committee * *July* 29 (No. 238)
- Report * *July* 30
- Read 3ª * *August* 2
- *c.* Lords Amendts. considered *August* 5, [198] 1369
- Several agreed to; and one disagreed to; Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed"

[*cont.*

Pharmacy Act (1868) *Amendment Bill*—cont.
- *c.* Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Secretary Bruce, The Lord Advocate, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Adam, and Dr. Brewer
- Reason for disagreeing to one of the Lords Amendts. reported, and agreed to:—To be communicated to the Lords
- *l.* As returned from Commons (No. 282)
- Commons Reason for disagreeing considered; Amendt. not insisted on *August* 9
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 117]

PHILIPS, Mr. R. N., *Bury*
- French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 350

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 114]
- Read 2° * *May* 13
- Order for Committee discharged; committed to a Select Committee *June* 1
- Report of Select Committee *June* 10 [Bill 157]
- Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 11
- Considered * *June* 14 [Bill 161]
- Read 3° * *June* 14
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 17 (No. 134)
- Read 2ª * *June* 18
- Committee *; Report *June* 25
- Read 3ª * *June* 28
- Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 71]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 28 [Bill 137]
- Read 2° * *May* 31
- Order for Committee discharged; committed to a Select Committee *June* 3
- Report of Select Committee *June* 10 [Bill 158]
- Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report, and consolidated into Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill [Bill 161]

Pilotage Dues on Foreign Shipping
- Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Bright *May* 10, [196] 468

Pilots—Bristol Pilots at Falmouth
- Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *August* 10, [198] 1528

PIM, Mr. J., *Dublin City*
- Corn, Duty on, [195] 584
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 843
- 195] Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1031; *cl.* 14, 1149; Amendt. 1368, 1377, 1378; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1386, 1403; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1407, 1409; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1411; *cl.* 20, 1499; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1602, 1613
- 196] *cl.* 43, 349; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 395, 404; Consid. *add. cl.* 755, 757
- 197] Lords Amendts. 1961, 1985
- 198] 72

[*cont.*

PIM, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [197] 485
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1307
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 984
Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [195] 991
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 509
Stationery Office, [197] 1696
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 593, 624

PLATT, Mr. J., *Oldham*
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Res. [198] 1356
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1364

PLAYFAIR, Dr. Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Endowed Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [197] 150
Faraday, Proposed Monument to, [197] 1173
* Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1724; Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 830; *cl.* 4, 1115; *cl.* 9, 1120; *cl.* 17, 1123; *cl.* 24, 1235; *cl.* 44, 1394; Consid. 1456, 1460
Supply—Learned Societies, [198] 504
Report, [198] 693
Science and Art Department, [198] 203
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1438; Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1091

PLIMSOLL, Mr. S., *Derby Bo.*
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1366

POCHIN, Mr. H. D., *Stafford Bo.*
False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 728
Pharmacy Act Amendment, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [195] 1934
Trade Returns, [195] 575
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 422

Police Superannuations
Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 27, [195] 1695

POLLARD-URQUHART, Mr. W., *Westmeath Co.*
Army Estimates—Superannuation Allowances, [197] 150
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 837
False Weights and Measures, &c. [194] 727
Income Tax, Res. [194] 1531; [196] 1238
Ireland—Anketell, Mr., Murder of, [197] 351
Irish Church, Comm *cl.* 26, [195] 1620; Lords Amendts. [198] 75
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 253
Scotland—Poor Law, Motion for a Committee, [194] 522
Supply—Education, National, [198] 740
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1463, 1466
Science and Art Department, [198] 217

POOR LAW
Birmingham Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. Dixon; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 22, [194] 1901—*District Medical Officers*, Question, Mr. Bromley-Davenport; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 11, 1089
Catholic Children in Workhouses, Question, Mr. Kekewich; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 8, [197] 1419
District Asylums, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 22, [194] 1899
Fever Patients, Conveyance of, Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 1, [194] 411; Question, Captain Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 4, 626
Gilbert Unions, Question, Mr. Mitford; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 4, [194] 626; Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Colonel Bourne; Answers, Mr. Goschen *April* 20, [195] 1195
Ireland — Medical and Educational Charges, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Feb* 25, [194] 303
Keighley Union, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 29, [198] 891
Kensington Sick Asylum District, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 15, [195] 841
Magistrates and Boards of Guardians, Question, Colonel Dyott; Answer, Mr. Goschen *June* 17, [197] 119
Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 22, [195] 1354
Mines, Rating of Metalliferous, Question, Mr. St. Aubyn; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 1, [194] 407; Question, Colonel, Duncombe; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 26, [195] 1582
Narberth Union — Treatment of Refractory Vagrants, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Goschen *June* 18, [197] 308; *July* 15, 1890
Orphan Pauper Children, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 16, [195] 971
Pauperism and Emigration, Observations, Lord Houghton; Reply, Earl Granville; debate thereon *April* 16, [195] 943
Paupers, Emigration of, Question, Sir Thomas Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 4, [194] 627
Payment of Rates by Owners, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 1, [194] 409
Poor Law Amendment Bill, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. M'Mahon *Mar* 2, [194] 484
Poor Law (Ireland)—Area of Rating, Question, Mr. M'Mahon; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 18, [194] 111
Poor Law (Scotland)—Assessments, Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 12, [194] 1188
Poor Rates, Exemptions from, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Feb* 26, [194] 356
Poor Relief Assessment—Returns, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 2, [194] 485

[*cont.*

Poor Law—cont.
  St. Marylebone Workhouse School, Question, Mr. Cogan ; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 1, [197] 944
  St. Pancras Workhouse, Question, Colonel Barttelot ; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 13, [197] 1754 ; Question, Dr. Brewer ; Answer, Mr. Goschen *July* 14, 1820
  Union of Parishes in Westminster, Question, Dr. Brewer; Answer, Mr. Goschen *August* 3, [198] 1145
  Vagrancy, Question, Mr. Hunt ; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 19, [195] 1096; Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *July* 19, [198] 156

Poor Law
  Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a closer and more harmonious correspondence between the Central and Local Poor Law authorities, and, in consequence, a more uniform and efficient system of parochial administration would be established, and the incidence of Local Taxation would be safely rectified if, as in the case of Education, grants, conditional on efficiency, were made from National sources, through the medium of the Poor Law Board" (*Mr. Rathbone*) *June* 22, [197] 430 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Poor Law — Catholic and Dissenting Children Removal
  Moved, "That in any case where a board of guardians or any parish or union shall have made due provision within the workhouse or district school for the instruction in their own faith of children not of the Established Church, their religious rights being amply secured and the spirit of the law effectually carried out, it is inexpedient that the Poor Law Board should exercise its discretionary power to enforce the removal of such children to schools not under the control of the guardians or of the parish authorities" (*Mr. Thomas Chambers*) *July* 6, [197] 1334 ; after short debate, A. 29, N. 71 ; M. 42

Poor Law — Pauperism and Vagrancy (England)
  Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to consider the existing state of Pauperism and Vagrancy in England, and the principles upon which the Poor Laws are at present administered" (*Mr. Corrance*) *May* 10, [196] 471 ; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Poor Law—Poor in England and Wales
  Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the operation and administration of the Laws for the Relief of the Poor in England and Wales (*The Marquess Townshend*) *June* 22, [197] 399 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Poor Law (Scotland)
  Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Poor Law in Scotland ; and whether any and what Amendments should be made therein" (*Mr. Craufurd*) *Mar* 2, [194] 513 ; after debate, Motion agreed to
  Moved, "That the Select Committee on Poor Law (Scotland) do consist of Nineteen Members" (*Mr. Craufurd*) *Mar* 10; debate arising; debate adjourned till To-morrow
  Debate resumed *Mar* 17, 1617 ; Motion withdrawn ; Select Committee to consist of Twenty Members
  Committee nominated as follows :— Mr. Craufurd (Chairman), The Lord Advocate, Mr. Anderson, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Armitstead, Mr. Cameron, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Ellice, Mr. Crum-Ewing, Mr. Orr-Ewing, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. John G. C. Hamilton, Mr. Loch, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Miller, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. C. S. Parker, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland, and Sir David Wedderburn
  Report of Select Committee *July* 6
  (*Parl. P.* No. 301)

Poor Law Board Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Peel, Mr. Goschen*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 16 [Bill 166]
  Read 2° * *June* 17
  Committee * ; Report *June* 18
  Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 22 (No. 142)
  Read 2ª * *July* 13
  Committee * ; Report *July* 15
  Read 3ª * *July* 16
  Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 123]

Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill (*Mr. M'Mahon, Mr. Blake, Mr. Downing, Mr. Stacpoole*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 24 [Bill 18]
  Question, Mr. Kavanagh ; Answer, Mr. M'Mahon *Mar* 2, [194] 484
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 7, [195] 309
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bruen*) ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 8

Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Gregory, Colonel Vandeleur*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 173]
  Read 2° * *June* 28
  Referred to a Select Committee *July* 5
  And, on *July* 6, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. W. H. Gregory (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Blake, Mr. Cogan, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Forde, Marquess of Hamilton, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. H. A. Herbert, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. O'Reilly-Dease, Sir James Stronge, and Mr. Edward Wingfield Verner
  As amended by Select Committee [Bill 213]
  Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 15
  Considered * *July* 16
  Read 3° * *July* 19

[*cont.*

Poor Law (*Ireland*) *Amendment* (*No.* 2) *Bill*—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *July* 20 (No. 205)
Read 2ª * *July* 22
Committee * *July* 23
Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 54]

Poor Law (Scotland) Act (1845) Amendment Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Adam*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *April* 13, [195] 756; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 14
Read 2° * *April* 22 [Bill 80]
Referred to a Select Committee *May* 6
And, on *May* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—The Lord Advocate (Chairman), Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Charles Dalrymple, Mr. Orr Ewing, Lord Garlies, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. M'Lagan, Sir Alexander Maitland, Mr. Dyce Nicol, Sir William Scott, and Colonel Sykes; *June* 10, Mr. Craufurd, Mr. Finnie, Mr. Grieve, Mr. M'Laren added
Report *; Re-comm. *July* 19
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Poor Law Union Loans Bill (*Mr. Candlish, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Dillwyn*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 128]
Read 2° * *June* 10
Committee *; Report *June* 17 [Bill 167]
Re-comm. *; Report *June* 21
Considered * *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Devon*) *June* 24 (No. 148)
Read 2ª * *July* 5
Committee * *July* 15 (No. 194)
Report * *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 45]

Poor Relief (Ireland) Act (1862) Amendment Bill (*Admiral Seymour, Mr. O'Neill*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 11 [Bill 117]
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Lifford*) *June* 11 (No. 124)
Read 2ª * *June* 24
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 28
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 25]

PORTARLINGTON, Earl of
Irish Church, Report, [197] 1493
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1680
St. Patrick, Order of, [197] 1106
Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1572

PORTMAN, Lord
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations, 2R. [195] 1820
Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 691
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. Amendt. [195] 1335
[*cont.*

PORTMAN, Lord—cont.
Irish Church, [197] 354
Justices of the Peace Qualification, 2R. [197] 512
New Parishes, &c. 2R. [196] 1583
Stannaries, 2R. [196] 1083

Portugal—Case of Mr. J. Cassells, a British Subject
Question, Mr. Winterbotham; Answer, Mr. Otway *Feb* 19, [194] 125
Claims on the Government, Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 4, [196] 1243

Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties
Acts read:—Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider the said Acts" (*Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence*) *Mar* 16, [194] 1523; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

POST OFFICE
Australia, Communication with, Question, Mr. Young; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 5, [195] 140—*South Wales*, Question, Mr. Jones; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 26, 1582
Book Post, &c., Question, Mr. Stapleton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 12, [194] 1188; Question, Mr. Macfie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 22, 1895
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to reduce the rate of Inland Postage on printed matter to one halfpenny for two ounces, and that the postage on newspapers should be likewise reduced to one halfpenny" (*Mr. Graves*) *April* 6, [195] 233; after short debate, Previous Question put (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); A. 62, N. 229; M. 167
Electric Telegraphs, Purchase of, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 19, [194] 1787; Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, [196] 1299—*Submarine Cables*, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 19, [198] 154
England and France, Packet Service between, Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Bright *July* 19, [198] 154
Foreign Mails—Returns, Question, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Feb* 19, [194] 124
Life Assurances, Question, Mr. Wells; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 12, [194] 1188

Mail Contracts
American Mail Contracts, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 5, [194] 716
Cunard and Inman Contracts, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 12, To leave out from "That" and add "the Contracts entered into by the Postmaster General with Messrs. Cunard and Co. and Mr. William Inman for
[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

the conveyance of Mails from this Country to the United States be referred to a Select Committee of this House" (*Mr. Seely*), [194] 1281; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, A. 86, N. 115; M. 29; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to

Committee nominated by the Committee of Selection as follows:—Mr. Dent (Chairman), Mr. Greaves, Mr. E. T. Hamilton, Sir Massey Lopes, Mr. C. R. M. Talbot *Mar* 16, Mr. Graves, and Mr. Seely added by the House

Report of Select Committee *Mar* 23
(*Parl. P.* No. 106, 106-I)

Questions, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Sclater-Booth; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 16, [194] 1464

Inman Mail Service Contract, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 12, [194] 1186

Packet and Telegraph Contracts, Resolution of the House of the 24th July, 1860, read and rescinded; and in lieu thereof resolved—

"That in all Contracts extending over a period of years and creating a public charge, actual or prospective, entered into by the Government for the Conveyance of Mails by Sea, or for the purpose of Telegraphic Communications beyond Sea, there should be inserted the condition that the Contract shall not be binding until it has been approved of by a Resolution of the House" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *July* 13, [197] 1818; Motion agreed to

Ordered, That the said Resolution, and the Resolutions of the House of the 24th July 1860, be Standing Orders of this House

196] *United States—Contracts for Conveyance of Mails to*, Moved, "That Contracts, made subject to the judgment of the House, should be submitted to the House at as early a period in the Session as possible, &c." (*Mr. Seely*) *June* 1, 1128; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved, "That Contracts for the conveyance of Mails to the United States should not in future be made for longer than three years, and that the payments should be regulated by the number or weight of letters, newspapers, &c. conveyed" (*Mr. Seely*), 1157; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved, "That, proposals having been made for a regular conveyance of Mails to the United States at the freight of a penny per ounce of letters conveyed, negotiations should be entered into with the United States Post Office, for the establishment of a penny postage, which shall include the inland rates in the two countries, as well as the sea conveyance" (*Mr. Seely*), 1157

After short debate, Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient that Her Majesty's Government should take into consideration, and should endeavour to learn by communication with the Government of the United States, whether it is practicable to establish a greatly reduced rate of Postage between the two Countries" (*Mr. Ayrton*), 1159; after further short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Parl. Papers—
Correspondence—Postal Contracts No. 77
Papers—United States . . . . „ 58
Conventions—United States . . „ 181
Contract—Halifax, &c. Mail Service . . . . „ 36
Contract, Brazil, &c. . . . . . „ 331
Returns—West Indies . . . . „ 116
Correspondence—Australia . . „ 227

Money Orders—Charges on, Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 3, [196] 14

New York Mails and Plymouth—The Bremen Company, Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 26, [195] 1583

North German Confederation, The, Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 26, [195] 1584

Portpatrick Harbour, Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 8, [195] 360; Observations, Mr. W. Johnston; Reply, Mr. Ayrton; short debate thereon *April* 16, 982

Stornoway, Communication with, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 22, [194] 1900

Velocipedes and Post Office Service, Question, Mr. Hambro; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 13, [196] 745

Wales—Services in, Question, Mr. Walsh; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 7, [196] 1295

Western Ports, Landing Mails, Observations, Mr. R. N. Fowler; short debate thereon *May* 28, [196] 924

West India Mails, Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 3, [196] 15—*Falmouth and Plymouth*, Question, Mr. R. Fowler; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 12, [195] 574—*Sorting Letters*, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 15, 841

Post Office Savings Banks Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stansfeld*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 69]
Bill withdrawn* *May* 6

Potter, Mr. E., *Carlisle*
Lord Lieutenant (Cumberland and Westmoreland), Motion for an Address, [195] 747
Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1540
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 199
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1370

Potter, Mr. T. Bayley, *Rochdale*
Foreign Office—Bidwell and Murray, Messrs. [194] 1083

Powis, Earl of
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1745
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 29, [197] 1125; *cl.* 41, 1162

Presentation of Benefices belonging to Roman Catholics, &c. Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 22 (No. 209)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol*) *July* 29, [198] 890; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 2
c. Read 1° * *August* 2 [Bill 256]
Read 2° * *August* 5
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Considered * *August* 7
Read 3° * *August* 7
l. As amended by Commons (No. 287)
Commons Amendts. considered *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 109]

Prevention of Gaming (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Morley*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 20 (No. 206)
Read 2ª * *July* 23
Committee * *July* 26 (No. 225)
Report * *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 29
c. Read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 248]
Read 2° * *August* 2
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 87]

PRICE, Mr. W. E., *Tewkesbury*
Army—Militia Quartermasters, [194] 630

Printworks Regulation
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the hours of toil of the women and children employed in Printworks ought to be assimilated to the hours of toil of the women and children employed in factories" (*Mr. Charley*) *Mar* 16, [194] 1535; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Prisoners (*Political Offenders*)
Moved, "That it is the duty of the Government to institute a public inquiry into the penal discipline of our Prisons, for the purpose of a better classification of prisoners generally; distinguishing the tried from the untried, and those who may be charged with offences from those who, under exceptional circumstances, may be temporarily detained without any specific charge having been preferred against them" (*Mr. George Moore*) *June* 29, [197] 798; after debate, Question put; A. 31, N. 171; M. 140
Moved, "That Her Majesty's Government should inquire how far political offenders should be regarded as a separate class, and how far the severity of the punishment to which the political convicts in our Prisons have been already subjected may be regarded as reasonable grounds for a favourable consideration in their case" (*Mr. George Moore*), 815; Question put, and negatived

Prisons (*Religious Instruction*)
Motion for Address for "Returns of the County and Borough Prisons of England in which Religious Instruction is afforded to Prisoners of different Denominations, specifying which and at what cost to each:

[*cont.*

Prisons (*Religious Instruction*)—cont.

"And, of the number of Prisoners in each Prison, and to what Denomination they belong; the Returns to be made up to the 20th day of July 1869, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 284, of Session 1867-8" (*Mr. Maguire*) *July* 20, [198] 345; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Prisons (Scotland) Administration Act (1860) Amendment Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 143]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *June* 29 (No. 159)
Read 2ª * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 35]

Property, Appropriation of
Moved, That there be laid before this House, a Return of all Acts of Parliament whereby property belonging to any person, corporation, or trust has been taken from such person, corporation, or trust without their consent, and without securing to them full compensation for the property so taken, or without offence being charged against such person, corporation, or trust justifying such confiscation (*The Lord Redesdale*) *Mar* 5, [194] 684
Amendt. to leave out from ("consent") and insert ("together with the reasons stated in such Acts for the appropriation of such property") (*The Earl Granville*); after short debate, Amendt. and original Motion withdrawn

Public Departments—Concentration of
Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 13, [195] 677

Public Offices
Expenditure on the New, Observations, Mr. Goldney; Reply, Mr. Layard; short debate thereon *July* 12, [197] 1669
Great George Street, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 30, [195] 1973

Public Offices Concentration Bill
(*Mr. Layard, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 153]
Read 2° * and committed to a Select Committee *June* 24
Committee nominated by the Committee of Selection:—Sir Edward Buller (Chairman), Mr. Wilbraham Egerton Mr. H. W. Fitzwilliam, Mr. C. Sykes; *July* 2, Mr. C. Hanbury Tracy added, Colonel Vandeleur disch.
Report * *July* 6 (*Parl. P.* No. 296) [Bill 196]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 30

Public Houses, &c.
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that any measure for the general amendment of the Laws for Licensing Public Houses, Beer Houses, and Refreshment Houses should include the prohibition of the sale of Liquors on Sunday" (*Mr. Rylands*) *June* 22, [197] 447 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Public Parks (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Clure, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Pim, Mr. Maguire*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 147]
Read 2° * *June* 8
Committee * ; Report *June* 11
Read 3° * *June* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Lifford*) *June* 15 (No. 131)
Read 2ª * *June* 24
Committee * *July* 1 (No. 163)
Report * *July* 2
Read 3ª * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 28]

Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 217]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee * ; Report *July* 23
Considered * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *July* 27 (No. 233)
Read 2ª * *July* 29
Committee * ; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 58]

Public Works (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 202]
Read 2° * *July* 23
Committee * ; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 2 (No. 255)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee * ; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 74]

Queen Anne's Bounty Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *July* 13 (No. 185)
Read 2ª * *July* 20
Committee * ; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 23
c. Read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 243]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 9

Queensland
Alleged Slavery, Question, Sir John Simeon ; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 11, [196] 574
South Sea Islands, Slave Trade from the, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Monsell ; short debate thereon *June* 28, [197] 633 ; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 22, [198] 450
Parl. P. . . . . No. 408
Correspondence, 1868 . . . . [4131]

Raikes, Mr. H. C., *Chester*
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1415
Ireland—Representation of, [194] 357
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 917 ; *cl.* 25, 1601 ; *cl.* 27, 1870 ; *cl.* 32, Amendt. [196] 44
Married Women's Property, 3R. Amendt. [198] 401
Order of St. Michael and St. George, [194] 1348
Parliament—Youghal Election, New Writ, [195] 2072
Parliament—Decoration of the Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 708, 720
University Tests, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [194] 1451 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 790, 793 ; *add. cl.* 1094, 1099

Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. M'Mahon*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 22 [Bill 94]
Read 2° * *July* 8
Committee * ; Report *July* 16 [Bill [220]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 21 [Bill 230]

Railways
Purchase of Railway and Telegraph Lines, Question, Mr. Samuelson ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 19, [194] 1787 ; Question, Mr. Hunt ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, [196] 1299
Railway Bills—31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 119, *sec.* 35; Resolutions [194] 123
Railway Companies, Standing Order No. 185, Ordered, That in all cases in which Railway Bills of this Session shall (in accordance with the provisions of the Act 31st and 32d Victoria, cap. 119) have been submitted to a meeting of the proprietors of any Company in respect of additional powers conferred on such company, and shall have been approved at such meeting, it shall not be necessary to submit the Bill to a meeting of such company to be held in accordance with Standing Order No. 185, unless any of the powers specified in such Order shall have been inserted or materially altered in the House of Commons" (*The Chairman of Committees*) *April* 16, [195] 942
Railway Guards and Passengers Communication, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan ; Answer, Mr. Bright *Mar* 22, [194] 1903 ; Question, Mr. Palmer ; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 2, [195] 29 ; Question, Mr. Hinde Palmer ; Answer, Mr. Bright *June* 4, [196] 1243 ; Question, Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan ; Reply, Mr. Bright *August* 6, [198] 1433
(See Titles—*India, Ireland*)

Railway Accidents
Questions, Observations, Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 5, [194] 737
Abergele Accident, Questions, Observations, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson ; Answer, Mr. Dillwyn *May* 28, [196] 936
At the Swindon Station, Question, Mr. Cadogan ; Answer, Mr. Bright *Mar* 18, [194] 1656

[*cont.*

Railways—*cont.*

Board of Trade Circular, Question, Observations, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Reply, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *July* 26, [198] 725
Liability of Railway Companies for Accidents, Observations, Mr. C. Denison; Reply, Mr. Bright *August* 6, [198] 1434
On North British Railway, Motion for "Report of proceedings taken by the legal authorities of the district of St. Boswell's, N.B., with reference to the death of Mr. Lisle, who was killed on the North British Railway on the night of the 6th of November, 1868" (*Lord Kinnaird*) *May* 11, [196] 566; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 118)
Preston Railway Station, Question, Mr. Hermon; Answer, Mr. Bright *June* 10, [196] 1494

Parl. Papers—
Reports, 1869—Parts I. to IV. [4120]
Returns, 1868 . . . No. 286, 291
Report of Board of Trade . No. 150
Facing Points — Rules of Board of Trade . . . No. 225

Railway Signalling, Question, Major Walker; Answer, Mr. Bright *August* 6, [198] 1372
Smoking on Metropolitan Railways, Question, Mr. Cadogan; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 26, [195] 1579
South-Eastern Railway—Violation of Bye-law, Question, Captain Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Bright *June* 21, [197] 355
Waterloo and Whitehall Railway, Question, Mr. G. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 16, [195] 972

Railways Abandonment Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 29 [Bill 186]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee*; Report *July* 16 [Bill 219]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 22
Considered* *July* 23
Read 3°* *July* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Kimberley*) *August* 2 (No. 249)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *August* 3, [198] 1139; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee* *August* 5
Report* *August* 6
Read 3ª* *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 114]

Rathbone, Mr. W., *Liverpool*
Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [197] 385, 390, 394, 397, 398; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 533; *add. cl.* 536; Consid. Amendt. 1086
194] Bankruptcy, Leave, 790
196] Comm. *cl.* 6, 1216; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1404, 1413; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1417; *cl.* 91, 1607; Amendt. 1608, 1899; *cl.* 126, Amendt. 1900, 1901, 1903, 1904
197] *add. cl.* 417
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 843
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 177; Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 767
Infanticide, [198] 1143
Navy—Naval Contracts, [198] 644
Orphan Pauper Children, [195] 971 [*cont.*

Rathbone, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 679
Poor Law, Res. [197] 430, 443, 447
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee. [194] 975
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 423

Read, Mr. C. S., *Norfolk, E.*
Agricultural Returns, Res. [197] 837
Agricultural Statistics, [194] 2001, 2002; [196] 938
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1328
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [194] 1025
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [197] 1271, 1272, 1290, 1291; *cl.* 7, 1768; *add. cl.* 1770, 1771, 1772
County Financial Arrangements, [196] 879
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 11, [196] 845; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 846, 848, 852; *cl.* 36, 855
Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 974
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 376
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 236
Norwich Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 9
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1925
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 189
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 621; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 792, 798

Real Estate Intestacy Bill
(*Mr. Locke King, Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Hinde Palmer, Mr. Headlam*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Locke King*) *Mar* 9, [194] 956; Bill ordered, after short debate
Read 1°* *Mar* 11 [Bill 45]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 14, [197] 1820
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 169, N. 144; M. 25; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn* *August* 4

Real Property
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Law as to the Duty on the succession to Real Estate, and as to the exemption of Real Estate from Probate Duty, is anomalous and unequal, and demands the early and serious attention of the Government, with a view to its amendment" (*Mr. William Fowler*) *May* 11, [196] 586; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Rebow, Mr. J. G., *Colchester*
Ways and Means, Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 797

Recorders Deputies Bill
(*Mr. Denman, Mr. West*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 4 [Bill 107]
Read 2°* *May* 5

Recorders Deputies Bill—cont.
Committee *; Report *May* 10
Read 3° * *May* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Chelmsford*) *May* 13 (No. 105)
Read 2ª * *June* 8
Committee * *June* 11
Report * *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 23]

REDESDALE, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Appropriation of Property, Motion for a Return, [194] 684, 690, 691
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1747; Report, [198] 146
Chairman of Committees, [194] 284
Coronation Oath, The, [195] 1059, 1069
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. Amendt. [198] 1077; 3R. 1289, 1290
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1353
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 65, 70, 82, 291; Comm. *cl.* 6, 754; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 883; Report, 1488, 1492; *add. cl.* 1496, 1499; 3R. 1616
Life Peerages, Motion for an Address, [196] 10, 11; Comm. Preamble, 1192
Municipal Franchise, Report, [198] 145
Oriel College, Oxford, 2R. [194] 804
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 407
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 12
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 596, 799
Parochial Schools (Scotland), [195] 570; Report, [196] 1286; [198] 1451; Commons Amendts. 1470; Amendt. 1471, 1482, 1524
Pauperism and Emigration, [195] 969
Railway Companies Meetings, Comm. [195] 672
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [195] 572
Wiltes Peerage, Report, [196] 428

REED, Mr. C., *Hackney*
Herts Constabulary, [198] 1086
Metropolis—Victoria Park, [194] 486
Sunday and Ragged Schools, 2R. [196] 1959; Comm. [197] 464, 466
Tasmania—Public Worship, [194] 1085

Reformatory Schools Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 20 (No. 63)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 7, [196] 351; after short debate, Bill withdrawn

Regina v. *Overend, Gurney, & Co.*
Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Bruce *June* 30, [197] 821; Observations, Mr. Eykyn, 975; Reply, Mr. Bruce; debate thereon; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Fawcett*), put, and negatived *July* 1, 980; Observations, Mr. Fawcett; Reply, The Solicitor General *July* 5, 1194

Registration of Voters
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the Laws affecting the Registration of persons entitled to vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for Boroughs in England and Wales, and to report whether any and what amendments are required therein" (*Mr. Harcourt*) *Mar* 9, [194] 970; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Vernon Harcourt (Chairman), Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Candlish, Mr. Collins, Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Hodgkinson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Morley, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Pemberton, Mr. Rathbone, Viscount Sandon, and Mr. Wheelhouse
Report of Select Committee *July* 2 (*Parl. P.* No. 294)

Regulation of Railways Act (1868) Amendment Bill—*Afterwards* **Railway Companies Meetings Bill** (*Mr. Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Lefevre*) *April* 1, [195] 24; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 62]
Read 2° * *April* 5
Committee *; Report *April* 6
Read 3° * *April* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *April* 8 (No. 44)
Read 2ª * *April* 12
Committee, after short debate; Report *April* 13, 671
Read 3ª * *April* 15
Royal Assent *April* 19 [32 *Vict.* c. 6]

Religious, Educational, &c. Societies Incorporation Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Romilly*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 29 (No. 81)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 7, [196] 355; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *June* 4 (No. 116)
Re-comm.; Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *June* 25, [197] 567; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Removal of Municipal Magistrates
Question, Mr. Eastwick; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 11, [196] 572; Question, Earl Grey; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *June* 1, 1085
(See *O'Sullivan's Disability Bill*)

Representation of the People Act (1867) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Gourley*)
c. *The Ratepaying Clauses*, Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 19, [194] 127—*Registration of Householders*, Question, Mr. Eustace Smith; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 22, 157
Motion for Leave (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *Mar* 2, 510; Bill ordered, after short debate
Read 1° * *Mar* 10 [Bill 43]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 7, [196] 1334; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Representation of the People Act, 1867—*Representation of Minorities*
Question, Sir Henry Hoare; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 17, [197] 124

Representative Peers (Scotland and Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Stapleton, Colonel French, Colonel Stepney*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stapleton*) *Mar* 9, [194] 984; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° *
Bill withdrawn * *May* 27 [Bill 41]

Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl Grey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *April* 9, [195] 473 (No. 50)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 27, 1677
Amendt. to leave out from ("that") and insert ("a Select Committee be appointed to consider the state of the Representative Peerage of Scotland and Ireland, and the laws relating thereto" (*The Duke of Buccleuch*); after short debate, on Question, "Whether the words proposed to be left out, &c.;" Cont. 32, Not-Cont. 77; M. 45; resolved in the negative; Motion, as amended, agreed to; Committee appointed accordingly
Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 1693
And, on *April* 30, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Privy Seal, D. Somerset, D. Richmond, M. Bath, E. Doncaster, E. Airlie, E. Portarlington, E. Grey, V. Eversley, L. Elphinstone, L. Redesdale, L. Silchester, L. Monck
Report of Select Committee *June* 3 (*Parl. P.* L. No. 112*)

Revenue Officers Bill
(*Mr. Monk, Sir Harry Verney, Mr. Craufurd*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Monk*) *Feb* 23, [194] 271; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 14]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 17, 1573
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Pease*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 88, N. 207; M. 119; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Revising Barristers—Appointment of
Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 9, [198] 1487; Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 10, 1535; Question, Mr. West; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 11, 1541

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydfil*
*Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1294, 1329
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1967

RICHARDS, Mr. E. M., *Cardiganshire*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1321, 1322
Friendly Societies, Res. [195] 508
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 577
Supply—Science and Art Department, [198] 217

RICHMOND, Duke of
Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1866, 1868, 1873
Ireland—Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 386
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1846
Justices of the Peace Qualification, 2R. Amendt. [197] 510, 511
Parochial Schools (Scotland), [195] 1574; Comm. [196] 429, 432; *cl.* 1, 445; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 448; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 460, 466; Report, 1282, 1285
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [196] 78, 79; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 79; *add. cl.* 81

RIDLEY, Mr. M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 596
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1534

RIPON, Bishop of
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 53

Rivers—Pollution of
Question, Mr. James Howard; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 23, [194] 202; Question, Mr. Dodds; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *July* 22, [198] 453

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 207]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 15

ROBERTSON, Mr. D., *Berwickshire*
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Commission, Motion for Adjournment, [195] 2066; Nomination of Committee, [196] 629
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 884

RODEN, Mr. W. S., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 573

Roman Catholic Charities and Registration of Burials
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the operation of the Act 23 and 24 Vic. c. 134, being an Act to amend the Law regarding Roman Catholic Charities, and into that of any Acts passed subsequently to the passing of the above mentioned Act, which may or may have been held to modify or alter the operation of the above Act, or which relate to the subject matter thereof; and into the operation of the Act 52 Geo. 3, c. 146, and into that of the 27 and 28 Vic. c. 97, which Acts relate to the Registration of Burials" (*Mr. Newdegate*) *Feb* 26, [194] 384; Question put, A. 46, N. 85; M. 39

Roman Catholic Charities—Returns
Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 22, [195] 1362
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 30, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, a Return showing

[*cont.*

Roman Catholic Charities—Returns—cont.
the number of Deeds or Instruments enrolled during the last three years in the High Court of Chancery under the Act 23 and 24 Vic. c. 134, being an Act to amend the Law regarding the Roman Catholic Charities, and under any subsequent Act relating to or enlarging or extending the said Act, giving the names of the Trustees; the date of their execution of such Deeds or Instruments; and a summary or short description, together with the number of acres, of the property to which such Deeds or Instruments relate" (*Mr. Newdegate*), [198] 1014; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c; A. 58, N. 50; M. 8

Romilly, Lord
- Bankruptcy, 2R. [197] 1415; Comm. [198] 15; Amendt. 18, 679; 3R. 889
- Habitual Criminals, 2R. [194] 692; Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1329, 1330, 1332; *cl.* 14, 1341; Amendt. 1342; *cl.* 10, Amendt. [195] 223, 226; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 227, 229
- Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. [198] 681
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1701; Comm. *cl.* 7, [197] 757; *cl.* 19, 1263, 1265; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1267
- Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 986
- Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 400
- Religious, Educational, &c. Societies Incorporation, 2R. [196] 355, 356; Comm. [197] 567, 569

Romney, Earl of
- Charity Commissioners, 2R. [197] 1749
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [198] 888; Comm. *cl.* 64, 991
- Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 30, [197] 1884

Rosse, Earl of
- Irish Church, Report, [197] 1491

Roumania—Jews in
- Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 9, [197] 1524

Royal Patriotic Fund Office
- *Defalcations by a Clerk*, Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, [194] 1465
- *School—The Boy M'Gregor*, Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 26, [195] 1583

Russell, Earl
- Bankruptcy, [194] 102
- Brazilian Slave Trade, Comm. [194] 623
- Education, Public, [194] 805
- Ireland—State of, [196] 707
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1666; [197] 162; Comm. Preamble, 723; *cl.* 27, 1015; *cl.* 28, 1071; Report, 1494, 1512; 3R. 1646; Commons Amendts. [198] 283, 425
- Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 452, 473; 2R. 1657, 1670; Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 1194, 1203, 1204; Report, 1373, 1387; 3R. [197] 1399
- Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 605
- University Tests, 2R. [198] 125

Russell, Colonel Sir W., *Norwich*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1167
- Norwich Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 15

Rutland, Duke of
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1687; Comm. Preamble, [197] 738; *cl.* 2, 749, 752; *cl.* 41, 1162

Ryde—Borough of
- Observations, Mr. W. W. Beach; Reply, Mr. Bruce; short debate thereon *June* 11, [196] 1631
- *Pier*, Questions, Sir James Elphinstone, Lord Henry Lennox; Answers, Mr. Childers *June* 21, [197] 358

Rylands, Mr. P., *Warrington*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [194] 1171
- Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 395
- Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1214; *cl.* 46, 1406; *cl.* 88, 1606; *cl.* 126, 1902
- Constabulary Returns, [195] 1850
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 440
- Government Contractors, [194] 482
- Navy—West Coast of Africa, [198] 1527
- Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 195
- Public Houses, &c. Res. [197] 447, 458
- Sunday Trading, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [195] 799, 805; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, [196] 1490
- Supply — Embassies and Missions Abroad, Amendt. [198] 913, 938, 949
  - Lord Lieutenant's Household, Amendt. [198] 508
  - Public Works (Ireland), [197] 1462
  - Rates on Government Property, [197] 1459
  - Stationery Office, [197] 1693
- Ways and Means, Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 787, 801

St. Aubyn, Mr. J., *Cornwall, W.*
- County Courts, 2R. [194] 1569
- Mines, Rating of, [194] 407
- Stannaries, Leave, [194] 399

St. David's, Bishop of
- Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 8
- China—Missionaries in, [194] 941
- Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1820; Comm. Preamble, [197] 720; *cl.* 12, 871

St. Katherine's Hospital
- Question, Observations, Earl Nelson; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *April* 30, [195] 1945

St. Lawrence, Viscount, *Galway Bo.*
- Ireland—Election Petitions, [195] 1096
- Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [196] 1466, 1475
- Supply—Report, [198] 693

St. Leonards, Lord
- Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds, 2R. Amendt. [198] 1062

ST. MAUR, Earl
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 912

St. Michael and St. George—Order of
Question, Mr. Raikes; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 15, [194] 1348

Sale of Liquors on Sunday
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that any measure for the general amendment of the Laws for Licensing Public Houses, Beer Houses, and Refreshment Houses should include the prohibition of the sale of Liquors on Sunday" (*Mr. Rylands*) *June* 22, [197] 447; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Pim, Mr. Peel Dawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * Mar 1 [Bill 29]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 9, [194] 989
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Murphy*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *June* 9, [196] 1451
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "until the present system of licensing in Ireland be remodelled and placed on a new basis, it is, in the opinion of this House, inexpedient to proceed further with the consideration of this Bill" (*Mr. Murphy*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

SALISBURY, Marquess of
Bankruptcy, [194] 96
Beerhouses, &c. 2R. [196] 1583
Bright, Mr., Letter of, [197] 15
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. [196] 83
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 3R. Amendt. [198] 1137
Education, Public, [194] 818
Endowed Schools, Comm. [197] 1874; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1877, 1879; *cl.* 19, 1882; *cl.* 30, 1883
Government of India Act Amendment, [195] 222; 1R. 1080; 2R. 1841; Report, Amendt. [196] 690, 698, 702
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1070
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 348; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1313, 1316; *cl.* 10, 1333; *cl.* 13, 1338; *cl.* 14, 1340, 1342; *cl.* 10, [195] 225, 226; *cl.* 12, 228
India—Bengal Bank at Bombay, [197] 513
Railways—Financial Statement, [198] 542, 545
Infant Life Preservation, 2R. [197] 1739
Ireland—Cork, Mayor of, [196] 77
Irish Policy of the Government, [196] 357
197] Irish Church, 2R. 81, 82; Comm. Preamble, 738; *cl.* 2, 749; *cl.* 6, 754; *cl.* 13, 877; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 901, 916; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 918, 920; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1001; *cl.* 28, 1065;
[*cont.*

SALISBURY, Marquess of—*cont.*
197] *cl.* 29, 1126; *cl.* 33, 1157, 1164; *cl.* 68, 1245, 1248; Report, Amendt. 1496, 1507, 1508, 1520, 1524
198] Commons Amendts. 300, 423, 443
Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 461; 2R. 1656; Comm. Preamble, [196] 1192; *cl.* 1, 1194, 1203; Report, 1377
Parliament—Business of the House, [198] 14
Order in the House, [197] 404
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 12
Parliamentary Proceedings, 2R. [194] 588, 617, 620, 799
Railway Companies Meetings, Comm. [195] 671
Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland, 2R. [195] 1688, 1690
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1182

Salmon Fisheries
Address for, "Return of the rent or value of the stake or bag-net fishings in Scotland as the same appear in the valuation roll of the counties or burghs within which such fishings are situate, with their rental for each year as shown in the valuation rolls for the last ten years" (*Lord Abinger*) *Mar* 11, [194] 1082; after short debate, Address agreed to
Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 20, [195] 1196
Salmon Passes on the Shannon, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *May* 13, [196] 743; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *June* 28, [197] 648
Scotch Salmon Fishery Act, 1862, Question, Lord Abinger; Answer, The Earl of Morley *July* 13, [197] 1753
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the present state of the Laws affecting the Salmon Fisheries of England and Wales, and to report whether any and what amendments are required therein" (*Mr. Dodds*) *June* 17, [197] 161
And, on *June* 25, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Dodds (Chairman), Colonel Amcotts, Mr. Assheton, Colonel W. Edwardes, Mr. Hambro, Mr. H. A. Herbert, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Knight, Mr. Liddell, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. Pease, Earl Percy, Mr. Evan Richards, and Mr. Whitwell
Report of Select Committee *July* 27 (*Parl. P.* No. 361)
Eighth Report—(*Parl. P.* No. 184)

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *Mar* 16, [194] 1543; Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1° * [Bill 56]
Read 2° * *Mar* 19
Committee *; Report *Mar* 22
Considered * *April* 6
Read 3° * *April* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *April* 8 (No. 43)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 12, [195] 571; Bill read 2ª, after short debate
[*cont.*

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill—cont.
Committee *; Report *April* 15
Read 3ª * *April* 16
Royal Assent *May* 13 [32 *Vict.* c. 9]

Salmon Fisheries Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 130]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 17

Salmon Fishery Legislation
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 23, [194] 2003; Question, Sir Herbert Croft; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *April* 16, [195] 975
Derwent Fishery—Judgment of Special Commissioners, Question, Mr. Dodds; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 17, [194] 90; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 23, 207

SALOMONS, Mr. Alderman D., *Greenwich*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1414; *cl.* 118, 1900
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 836
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 576; *cl.* 18, 581
Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal, [197] 1526
Jews in Roumania, [197] 1525
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 342
Navy—Dockyard Emigrants to Canada, [196] 1297
Navy Estimates—New Works, [195] 211
  Steam Machinery, [195] 209
Stamp Duties Exemptions, [195] 1849
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 799
Supply—Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1480
  Houses of Parliament, [197] 682
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 619

SAMUDA, Mr. J. D'A., *Tower Hamlets*
Army—Committee on New Arms, [198] 498
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 46, [196] 1405
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 829
Light Dues, Res. [196] 158
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 344
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1363
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [195] 121
  Men and Boys, [194] 919
  Naval Stores, [195] 193
  New Works, [195] 213
  Steam Machinery, [195] 193
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 918
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 516
Rateable Property (Metropolis), Leave, [194] 183
Trades Unions, 2R. [197] 1383
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 612

SAMUELSON, Mr. B., *Banbury*
Assessed Rates, Consid. *add. cl.* [197] 1082
British Columbia, Motion for Papers, [196] 1105
Education Votes, [197] 515
Electric Telegraphs, [194] 1787
Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1401
Factory and Workshop Act, [198] 683
Schools of Science, [198] 158
Supply—Science and Art Department, [198] 217

SAMUELSON, Mr. H. B., *Cheltenham*
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, Res. [197] 1585
Poor Laws—Keighley Union, [198] 891
Slave Trade—Brazilian Vessels, [194] 354

SANDON, Viscount, *Liverpool*
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), Comm. [195] 220
Education in Large Towns, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1233
Education, Primary, [198] 152
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1328
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 901; *cl.* 29, 1932
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 618
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [195] 1979
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 659
Registration of Voters, Motion for a Committee, [194] 980
University Tests, [198] 452

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 28 [Bill 244]
Read 2° * *August* 2
Committee *; Report *August* 3
Read 3° * *August* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Devon*) *August* 5 (No. 273)
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 108]

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 3 [Bill 261]
Read 2° * *August* 4
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *August* 7 (No. 279)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 100]

Sanitary Acts—Consolidation of
Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 23, [194] 2000

SARTORIS, Mr. E. J., *Carmarthenshire*
Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 138
New Zealand—Imperial Troops in the Colony, [195] 675
University Tests, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1095; [198] 451

Sat First

Dec 10, 1868—James Bishop of Hereford
Dec 15—The Earl of Abergavenny, after the death of his Father
The Lord Carysfort, after the death of his Father
Feb 11, 1869—The Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe
Feb 16—Archibald Campbell Archbishop of Canterbury
John Bishop of London
William Connor Bishop of Peterborough
Richard Chevenix Archbishop of Dublin
Feb 18—The Lord Carleton, after the death of his Father
The Duke of Norfolk, after the death of his Father
April 19—The Viscount Gough, after the death of his Father
April 22—The Earl De La Warr, after the death of his Father
April 26—The Lord Cloncurry, after the death of his Father
April 30—The Earl Ferrers, after the death of his Father
May 3—The Lord Meldrum, after the death of his Father
May 7—The Earl of Ilchester, after the death of his Uncle
May 10—The Lord Bishop of Tuam
May 11—The Lord Wynford, after the death of his Father
May 13—The Earl of Hillsborough, after the death of his Father
June 14—The Marquess of Anglesey, after the death of his Father
The Earl of Radnor, after the death of his Father
The Lord Leconfield, after the death of his Father
The Lord Ross, after the death of his Brother
The Viscount Combermere, after the death of his Father
The Lord Fingall, after the death of his Father
June 21—The Lord Hawke, after the death of his Brother
June 22—The Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart, after the death of his Father
June 28—The Lord Ashburton, after the death of his Father
July 1—The Lord Stanley of Alderley, after the death of his Father

Representative Peers for Ireland
(Writs and Returns.)
Feb 16—The Earl of Rosse, *v.* Henry Baron Farnham, deceased
July 8—The Earl of Bantry, *v.* The Earl of Wicklow, deceased

Representative Peer for Scotland
(Writ and Return.)
July 8—The Earl of Kellie; Certificate read

New Peers Introduced

Dec 15, 1868—The Right Hon. Sir William Page Wood, Knight, Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, Baron Hatherley of Down-Hatherley in the county of Gloucester

Sat First—New Peers Introduced—cont.

Dec 15, 1868—William Ernest Baron Feversham Viscount Helmsley of Helmsley and Earl of Feversham of Ryedale in the North Riding of the county of York
Feb 18, 1869—The Earl of Caithness, a Peer of Scotland, Baron Barrogill of the United Kingdom
Mar 2—Edward Anthony John Viscount Gormanston, a Peer of Ireland, created Baron Gormanston of Whitewood in the county of Meath
April 15—The Right Hon. Sir John Laird Mair Lawrence, baronet, G. C. B., G.C.S.I., Baron Lawrence of the Punjaub and of Grately in the county of Southampton
April 23—The Right Hon. Sir James Plaisted Wilde, knight, Baron Penzance of Penzance in the county of Cornwall
July 2 — Lord Rollo, Baron Dunning of the United Kingdom

Saunderson, Mr. E. J., *Cavan Co.*
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1377; *cl.* 19, 1492

Savings Banks
Questions, Mr. Cawley, Mr. Hibbert; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 26, [195] 1581

Savings Banks and Post Office Savings Banks Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Resolution in Committee *July* 6
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 199]
Read 2° * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *July* 22 (No. 211)
Read 2ª * *July* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 59]

Savings Banks Returns
Question, Mr. Wells; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *May* 4, [196] 101

Sclater-Booth, Mr. G., *Hampshire, N*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [196] 1909; [197] 314
Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 2, [196] 870, 871; Consid. *cl.* 3, [197] 551
Gold Coinage, [198] 1409, 1422
Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1817
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. Amendt. [195] 1298; Comm. [196] 1450
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 339
Metropolitan Street Tramways, Consid. *add. cl.* [196] 738

[*cont.*

SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. G.—*cont.*

- Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1793
- Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [198] 1444
- Post Office—Mails to the United States, [194] 1465
- Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1307
- Scotland—Sheriff Courts, [196] 1634
- Sunday and Ragged Schools, Comm. [197] 465
- Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 646
  - Board of Trade, [197] 1683
  - Civil Service Estimates, Vote on Account, [195] 537
  - Common Law Courts, [198] 1003
  - Consular Services, [198] 953
  - Distressed British Seamen, [198] 963, 965
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 949, 950, 951
  - Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677, 678
  - Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1480
  - House of Commons Offices, [197] 1476, 1477
  - House of Lords Offices, [197] 1476
  - Houses of Parliament, [197] 680; Report, 1441
  - Learned Societies, [198] 504, 506
  - Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 509
  - Lunacy Commission, [197] 1685
  - Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 971, 972
  - Poor Law Commission, [197] 1688
  - Probate Court and Registries, [197] 1211
  - Public Buildings, [197] 674, 675, 676
  - Public Offices Site, [197] 1203, 1206
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Department (Scotland), [197] 1710
  - Report, [198] 515, 519
  - Royal Parks, &c. [197] 668, 671
  - Treasury, &c. Departments, [197] 1478, 1479
  - Works, &c. [197] 1705
- Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 5, [198] 771; *cl.* 12, 772
- Transit of Venus, [198] 1395
- Treasury Board, Constitution of the, [194] 124, 842
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 417; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 790

SCOTLAND

- *Agriculture — Employment of Women and Children*, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 15, [194] 1355
- *Ayrshire, Distributor of Stamps for*, Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *August* 3, [198] 1144
- *Courts of Law Commission*, Question, The Earl of Minto; Answer, The Earl of Morley *April* 26, [195] 1575
- *Cumbrae Lights, The*, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *July* 27, [198] 799
- *Education*, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 22, [194] 1904
  - Minute of Committee of Council *July* 14 (*Parl. P.* No. 322)

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—*cont.*

- *Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Return, in a tabulated form, from each county in Scotland showing the total number of non-resident proprietors qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, distinguishing in separate columns the number of those whose property in such county as shown by the Valuation Roll is of less annual value than £100, £50, £20, and £14, and also those at and under £10 respectively; showing the nature of the qualification whether Fiars, Life Renters, Superiors, or Feuars; also the number of such County Voters resident within any Royal or Parliamentary Burgh within each county respectively" (*Mr. Craufurd*), [194] 1253; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- *Faggot Voting in Peeblesshire*, Petition presented (*Sir Edward Colebrooke*); Questions, Sir Graham Montgomery; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 12, [194] 1185
- *Game Laws* (*Scotland*)—See that title
- *Hypothec, Law of*, Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the operation of the Law of Hypothec in Scotland" (*The Earl of Airlie*) *Mar* 12, [194] 1178; after short debate, Motion agreed to
  - And, on *Mar* 18, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Privy Seal, E. Doncaster, E. Airlie, E. Graham, E. Grey, E. Minto, E. Morley, E. Camperdown, L. Saltoun, L. Wharncliffe, L. Rossie, L. Panmure, L. Abinger, L. Portman, L. Clandeboye, and L. Colonsay
    - Report—*Parl. P.* . . . . *l.* 45
    - Return 74
  - Question, The Duke of Cleveland; Answer, The Earl of Airlie *Mar* 18, [194] 1652
- *Income Tax*, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, [196] 389; Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 10, 471
- *Police Systems of Scotland*, Observations, The Earl of Minto; Reply, The Earl of Morley; short debate thereon *May* 13, [196] 700
- *Poor Law Amendment*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate *August* 4, [198] 1253
- *Poor Law* (*Scotland*)—See that title
- *Poor Law* (*Scotland*)—*Assessments*, Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 12, [194] 1188
- *Portpatrick Harbour and Lighthouse*, Question, Lord Garlies; Answer, Mr. Bright *Feb* 18, [194] 110; Observations, Lord Garlies *Feb* 26, 367; Reply, Mr. Bright, 371; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Mar* 18, 1656; Question, Sir Frederick W. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 8, [195] 360; Observations, Mr. W. Johnston; Reply, Mr. Ayrton; short debate thereon *April* 16, 982
- *Public Business connected with Scotland*, Questions, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Bouverie; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *August* 5, [198] 1296

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
- *Queen's Remembrancer*, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 12, [194] 1187
- *Salmon Fisheries*, Address for, "Return of the rent or value of the stake or bag-net fishings in Scotland as the same appear in the valuation roll of the counties or burghs within which such fishings are situate, with their rental for each year as shown in the valuation rolls for the last ten years" (*Lord Abinger*) *Mar* 11, [194] 1082; after short debate, Address agreed to
- Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Mr. Bruce *April* 20, [195] 1196
- *Scotch and Irish Fisheries*, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Childers *July* 29, [198] 893
- *Scotch Salmon Fishery Act*, 1862, Question, Lord Abinger; Answer, The Earl of Morley *July* 13, [197] 1753
- *Sheriff Courts*, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, The Lord Advocate; short debate thereon *June* 11, [196] 1634
- *Truck Act*, Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 15, [197] 1885
- *Waternish Church, Isle of Skye*, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 15, [197] 1886; Question, Mr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Bruce *July* 27, 798

Scott, Lord H. J. M. D., *Hampshire, S.*
- Irish Church, Comm. [195] 921
- Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 822
- Scotland—Faggot Votes in Scotch Counties, Motion for a Return, [194] 1273

Scourfield, Mr. J. H., *Pembrokeshire*
- Agricultural Labourers, Res. [197] 605
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 865
- Criminal Law — Liberation of Sir Eardley Culling Eardley, [195] 1200
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 834; *cl.* 22, 853
- Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1319
- Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1399; Comm. *cl.* 29, [196] 1772
- Irish Church, Comm. [195] 910; Consid. [196] 770, 777
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 922
- Parliament—Decoration of Central Hall, Motion for a Committee, [198] 720
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1508
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 662
- Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 927
- Supply—Horses, Tax on, [195] 1097
  - Poor Law Commission, [197] 1688
  - Report, [194] 539
  - Stationery Office, [197] 1693
- Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 4, [198] 767
- Ways and Means, Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties, [196] 803

Sea Birds Preservation Bill
(*Mr. Sykes, Mr. Clay, Mr. Ward Jackson*)
- *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sykes*) *Feb* 26, [194] 404; Bill ordered
- Read 1° * *Mar* 1 [Bill 28]

[*cont.*

Sea Birds Preservation Bill—cont.
- *c.* Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 5, [194] 775
- Committee *; Report *Mar* 18 [Bill 59]
- Considered *April* 9, [195] 557
- Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed for the purpose of excluding Scotland from its operation" (*Mr. Fordyce*); Motion negatived
- Read 3° * *April* 12
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Northumberland*) *April* 12 (No. 54)
- Read 2ª * *April* 26
- Committee *May* 4, [196] 78 (No. 92)
- Report * *May* 10
- Read 3ª * *May* 11
- *c.* Lords Amendts. agreed to *June* 1 [Bill 125]
- Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 17]

Sea Fisheries Act (1868) Extension Bill
(*Mr. Andrew Johnston, Colonel Brise, Mr. Donald Dalrymple*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 9 [Bill 156]
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 14

Sea Fisheries Act (1868) Supplemental Bill (*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 146]
- Read 2° * *June* 10
- Committee *; Report *June* 11
- Considered * *June* 14
- Read 3° * *June* 14
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 15 (No. 132)
- Read 2ª * *June* 17
- Committee *; Report *June* 24
- Read 3ª * *June* 25
- Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 31]

Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Viscount Burke, Colonel Annesley, Mr. Kavanagh*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 51]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 9, [196] 1457; after debate, Bill read 2°
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Sea Fishing Boats
- Question, Sir Herbert Croft; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 23, [195] 1464

Seamen's Clothing Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Camperdown*)
- *l.* Presented; read 1ª * *July* 12 (No. 189)
- Read 2ª * *July* 20
- Committee *; Report *July* 22
- Read 3ª * *July* 23
- *c.* Read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 242]
- Read 2° * *July* 28
- Committee *; Report *July* 29
- Read 3° * *July* 30
- Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 57]

Sea—Rule of the Road at
- Observations, Sir John Hay; Reply, Mr. Bright *Feb* 26, [194] 371; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 23, [195] 1465

Seeds Adulteration Bill (*Mr. Welby, Mr. Brand, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Read*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 12 [Bill 49]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 16, [196] 1916; after debate, Bill read 2°
Referred to Select Committee; Select Committee nominated *June* 28 as follows:—Mr. Welby (Chairman), Mr. Backhouse, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Brand, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Collins, Mr. Cross, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Norwood, Mr. C. S. Read, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; *July* 6, Mr. O'Neill, Dr. Playfair added; *July* 7, Mr. Pell added
Report of Select Committee *July* 19 (*Parl. P.* No. 335)
Committee *—R.P. *July* 21 [Bill 222]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 28
Considered * *July* 29
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Devon*) *July* 30 (No. 242)
Read 2ª * *August* 2
Committee *August* 5, [198] 1283 (No. 276)
Report * *August* 6
Read 3ª * *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 112]

Seely, Mr. C., *Lincoln City*
Navy—Admiralty Accounts, [198] 1526
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1281; Res. [196] 1128, 1155, 1157
Supply—Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1466

Select Vestries
Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª * *Feb* 16

Selkirk, Earl of
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Commons Amendts. [198] 1479
Scotland — Hypothec, Law of, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1184

Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J., *Essex, W.*
Assessed Rates, Consid. *add. cl.* [197] 1083
Beerhouses, &c. Leave, [194] 403; 2R. [195] 1763
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Leave, [194] 92; 2R. 1036
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 16, [197] 1292
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 31, Amendt. [196] 1778, 1779; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1779; *cl.* 41, 1782
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Instruction, Motion for Adjournment, [197] 467
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 471
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [197] 1190
Railway Accidents, [194] 737; [196] 936; [198] 725

Seymour, Rear-Admiral G. H., *Antrim Co.*
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [195] 120
 sSteam Machinery, [195] 209
Rule of the Road at Sea, [194] 371
Scotland—Portpatrick Harbour, [195] 986

Shaftesbury, Earl of
China—Missionaries in, [194] 946; [195] 135
*Ecclesiastical Courts, 2R. [195] 808, 840; Nomination of Committee, 1353; Withdrawal of Bill, [198] 885
Habitual Criminals, 1R. [194] 345; 2R. 697; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1311, 1312, 1315, 1316, 1319; *cl.* 10, 1323; *cl.* 13, 1338; *cl.* 17, 1348; *cl.* 12, Amendt. [195] 227, 228
Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 281
Married Women's Property, 2R. [198] 987

Shaw, Mr. R., *Burnley*
Army—Canteens, [194] 1464
 Concentration of Army Offices, [195] 1577
Irish Church, Lords Amendts. [198] 73
St. James and St. Paul's, Lancashire, [195] 576
Supply—Consular Services, [198] 953

Shaw, Mr. W., *Bandon*
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 1732; Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 36; *cl.* 59, 415; Consid. 780

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1334, 1336
Convention of Paris, Motion for Papers, [196] 1445, 1448
Fire Insurances, Res. [195] 305, 307, 308; [196] 574
Life Assurance Companies, Leave, [194] 585
Mexico—Bondholders, [198] 897
 Diplomatic Relations with, [195] 845
Parliament—Business of the House, [198] 906
Police Constables, Pay of, [197] 1663
Railway Guards and Passengers Communication, [194] 1903; [198] 1433, 1438, 1439
Representation of the People Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [194] 510; 2R. [196] 1334
Sierra Leone — Thomas *v.* Huggins, Case of, Res. [198] 1214, 1217

Sherlock, Mr. D., *King's Co.*
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 952
Dublin Freemen Commission, Comm. [198] 232
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1277
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. [195] 1497, 1506; *cl.* 26, 1624
Roman Catholic Charities, Motion for Returns, [198] 1027
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [196] 1454
Supply—Education, National, [198] 740
 Flax Cultivation (Ireland), [198] 967
 Stationery Office, [197] 1700

Sheriffs (York County) Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered * *April* 29
Read 1° * *May* 3 [Bill 102]
Question, Mr. H. F. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *June* 3, [196] 1208
Moved, "That the Order for 2R. be read, and discharged" (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*); Order discharged; Bill withdrawn

SHERRIFF, Mr. A. C., *Worcester (City)*
Judicial Commission, The, [195] 975

Shipping Dues Exemption Act (1867) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. William Cowper*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *June* 28 [Bill 184]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee*; Report *July* 6
Considered* *July* 7
Read 3°* *July* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 8 (No. 178)
Read 2ª* *July* 27
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 2 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 52]

Shipping Dues in Foreign Ports
Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 26, [198] 682

SIDEBOTTOM, Mr. J., *Staleybridge*
Société Industrielle et Agricole d'Egypte, [197] 1167

Sierra Leone—Case of Thomas v. *Huggins*
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a Court of Inquiry should be held at Sierra Leone to investigate the charges against Mr. Horatio James Huggins, the Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, contained in the Petition from that Settlement sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies" (*Mr. Henry Brinsley Sheridan*) *August* 3, [198] 1214; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Silk Manufactures
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 18, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Commercial Treaty with France, ratified the 13th day of January 1860, and particularly as it affects the Silk Manufacture in this Country" (*Mr. Staveley Hill*), [197] 329; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 155, N. 101; M. 54

SIMEON, Sir J., *Isle of Wight*
Queensland—Alleged Slavery in, [196] 574
Rates and Taxes, Collection of, [194] 839
Ryde, Borough of, [196] 1632

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1333
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 157; Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1214; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1217; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1417; *cl.* 53, Amendt. 1418; *cl.* 54, 1593; *cl.* 59, 1600; *cl.* 91, 1899; *cl.* 131, Amendt. [197] 415
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 863, 865
China—Communication with, [198] 1037
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1567
[*cont.*

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J.—*cont.*
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 775; Comm. Amendt. [195] 217, 221
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 569
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 176; Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 575; *cl.* (D) 12, 578; *cl.* 14, 580; Consid. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 761, 764, 766

SIMONDS, Mr. W. B., *Winchester*
Army—Volunteer Capitation Grant, [196] 1298

Slave Trade
Brazilian Vessels, Question, Mr. Henry Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Feb* 26, [194] 354
Cape Colony—Enslavement of Kaffir Children, Question, Mr. R. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Monsell; short debate thereon *Feb* 19, [194] 128
Queensland—Alleged Slavery, Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Mr. Monsell *May* 11, [196] 574
South Sea Islands, from the, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Monsell; short debate thereon *June* 28, [197] 633; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 22, [198] 450
Parl. P. August 9 . . . . . No. 408
Correspondence, 1868 . . . . [4131]
West Coast of Africa, Question, Sir William Hutt; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 8, [194] 831

Sligo Election—Joint Address for a Commission
Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *April* 9, [195] 566; Motion agreed to
Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 16, 974
Address agreed to *June* 8
Her Majesty's Answer reported *June* 21

SMITH, Mr. F. C., *Nottingham*
Bankruptcy, 2R. [195] 167

SMITH, Mr. J. B., *Stockport*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), 2R. [195] 435; Comm. *cl.* 67, [197] 1539; *cl.* 90, 1758; *cl.* 96, Amendt. 1759, 1761, 1763; *cl.* 101, *ib.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [196] 840
Gold Coinage, [198] 1408
India—Budget, The, [194] 201
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [198] 1198, 1343
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 16, [195] 1409
Metric System of Weights and Measures, [195] 972
Ways and Means, Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), [195] 620

SMITH, Mr. T. E., *Tynemouth, &c.*
Assessed Rates, Leave, [194] 325
Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 627
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [195] 99
Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, Motion for a Committee, [194] 1297
Registration of Householders, [194] 157

Smith, Mr. W. H., *Westminster*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 849
District Asylums, [194] 1899
License Duties on Servants, [195] 1849
Metropolis—New Courts of Justice, [195] 356
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [198] 1055; 3R. Amendt. 1335
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [196] 1364, 1365
Paraguay—British Subjects in, [198] 1248
Pauperism and Vagrancy, Motion for a Committee, [196] 512
Public Offices, Great George Street, [195] 1973
Telegraph, Comm. [198] 755
Valuation of Property (Metropolis), 2R. [195] 20

Solicitor General, The (Sir J. D. Coleridge), *Exeter*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 32, [196] 1402; *cl.* 46, 1415; *cl.* 54, 1593, 1595; *cl.* 59, 1601; *cl.* 91, 1898
Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1319
Durham, University of, [194] 1898
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, [196] 1764; *cl.* 15, 1766
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 763
Irish Church, 2R. [194]* 1938; Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1146, 1152, 1381; *cl.* 20, 1500; *cl.* 39, [196] 339
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1224
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 2R. [195] 1321, 1324
Married Women's Property, 2R. [195] 794
Navy—Admiralty Clerks, Res. [196] 1626
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 226, 233
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [197] 1860
Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co. [197] 1196, 1198
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 400
Undue Influence and Bribery, [196] 1497
University Tests, Leave, [194] 272; 2R. 1041, 1046, 1054, 1457; Comm. *cl.* 1, [197] 789; *cl.* 6, 792; *add. cl.* 1097, 1101, 1103; [198] 452

Somerset, Duke of
Bishops of the South Western District, [196] 4
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1743; Report, [198] 146
China—Missionaries in, [194] 933; [195] 131
Civil Service Pensions, Comm. [196] 81, 85
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1351
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [197] 1876
Governor General of India, 2R. [194] 1078
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1341
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 13, [197] 874; *cl.* 25, 998; Report, 1492; 3R. 1635
Naval Stores, 2R. [195] 673
Navy—Armament of Turret Ships, [195] 340, 352
Newspapers, &c. 2R. [196] 968
Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1568

South Eastern Railway—Violation of Bye-Law
Question, Captain Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Bright *June* 21, [197] 355

South Kensington Museum
Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *June* 25, [197] 570
Deterioration of Pictures in, Motion for Address for "Copy of the Report of the Committee appointed by the Science and Art Department to inquire into the alleged deterioration of the Pictures belonging to the National Gallery, deposited at the South Kensington Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *June* 11, [196] 1635; Motion withdrawn
(See *National Gallery*)

Spain
Imprisonment of a British Subject at Barcelona, Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, Mr. Otway *June* 14, [196] 1741—*at Cuba*, Question, Mr. Crum-Ewing; Answer, Mr. Otway *Feb* 22, [194] 159
"*Mermaid*," *the, Case of*, Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Mr. Otway *Mar* 18, [194] 1659
Seizure of the "Mary Lowell" in British Colonial Waters, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 4, [196] 105; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 6, 264
"*Tornado*," *the, Case of*, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Otway *Mar* 8, [194] 836—*Petition of Crew*, Observations, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, The Earl of Clarendon *April* 8, [195] 353; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Otway *May* 13, [196] 743; *June* 10, 1499
Parl. P. . . . . [4126, 1 & 2]
Treaty of Commerce with, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 8, [197] 1425

Speaker, The (Right Hon. J. E. Denison) *Nottinghamshire, N.*
The Right Honourable John Evelyn Denison being proposed by the Right Hon. Sir George Grey (the Motion being seconded by the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole) as Speaker, is unanimously called to the Chair; and expresses his thanks to the House *Dec.* 10, [194] 4
Mr. Speaker Elect is presented to the Lords Commissioners; who thereupon signify Her Majesty's approbation *Dec* 11, 11; Mr. Speaker reports to the Commons Her Majesty's approval of their choice, and takes and subscribes the Oath *Dec* 11

Adjournment of Debate—The House has, by common acceptation, conceded the right of pre-audience, when the debate is resumed, to the Member who has moved the adjournment, [194] 1470
Amendment—Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" an Amendment moved. A Member cannot make another Motion before that which is before the House is disposed of.—*Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy*, [198] 633
Amendment—Right of Reply—A Member who has moved an Amendment has no right of reply.—*Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy*, [198] 632

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Committee—Instruction—A proposed Instruction to a Committee is not in order when the Committee already possesses the power proposed to be given to it by the Instruction. By a Standing Order of 1854 all Committees have the power to make such Amendments as they deem fit in Bills, provided they are relevant to the subject of the Bill.—*Irish Church Bill,* [195] 847

Debate—A document not yet laid before the House cannot be accepted as an authentic record.—*Dublin Election,* [195] 1273

Debate—Latitude in Debate—A Member appearing to be discussing a subject, though there was no Question before the House, being called to Order—Mr. Speaker said, I think the House will allow the right hon. Gentleman a reasonable latitude; but I think also I must lay emphasis on the word "reasonable."—*Recent Negotiations with the United States,* [197] 1427, 1428

Debate—Limitation of Explanation—A Member who, under certain circumstances, has moved, "That the House do now adjourn," and subsequently wishes to withdraw his Motion, must limit his Explanation to the grounds on which he desires to do so.—*Regina v. Overend, Gurney, & Co.* [197] 995

Debate—Premature Discussion of a Subject—It is contrary to the rules of the House for a Member to enter upon the discussion of a Question on which he proposes a discussion on a future day.—*Recent Negotiations with the United States,* [197] 1428

Debate—Relevancy of Debate—On Motion for a Suspension of the Orders of the Day for the purpose of enabling the House to hold Morning Sittings, the conduct of the Mayor of Cork having been referred to, and Mr. Dawson Damer proposing to continue the subject—Mr. Speaker reminded the hon. Member that there was no Question before the House which would entitle hon. Members to discuss any Irish Question, [195] 1981; [196] 581

Debate—Speaking twice in the same debate

The Lords having struck out certain words in the Irish Church Bill, Mr. Gladstone moved "That the House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." Mr. Newdegate spoke on that Question. The Motion was withdrawn, and another Motion made limited to a part only of the Lords Amendment. Mr. Newdegate rose to speak: objected to; Mr. Speaker said, this being a new Question the hon. Member was perfectly in Order, [197] 1941, 1948

Mr. Gladstone's Motion having been agreed to, he moved to disagree with the Lords in the remainder of the said Amendment; after a short debate, Mr. Gladstone rose to address the House: objected to; Mr. Speaker said, that the right hon. Gentleman having made the Motion had deprived himself of the power of speaking on it, [197] 1949

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Right of reply. An hon. Member who has moved an Amendment has no right of reply—*Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy,* [198] 632

Moved, "That the [University Tests] Bill be now read the second time;" Mr. Beresford Hope moved, "That the debate be now adjourned;" Mr. Bentinck seconded the Motion; on division, negatived; Question again proposed, "That the word 'now,' &c." Mr. Beresford Hope rose to address the House on the main Question. Mr. Speaker said, that the hon. Member having made a Motion had exhausted his powers in this debate

Mr. Bentinck also rose to speak, saying that as he had seconded the Motion [for the adjournment of the debate] merely by a gesture, he thought he was at liberty to address the House on the main Question. Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member having seconded the Motion was not entitled to address the House—*University Tests Bill,* [194] 1451, 1469

Mr. Newdegate rose to speak, saying that he would conclude with a Motion. Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member having spoken in the debate could not make a Motion.

A Member who has moved the adjournment of a debate has, by the common acceptation of the House, the pre-audience when the debate is resumed

If, however, the House has declined to accede to the Motion, and has divided upon it, the Member who moved it, having had the opportunity of addressing the House had he thought fit, has lost the power of addressing the House on the main Question, [194] 1470; [196] 1365

Debate — Effect of Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," on subsequent Motions—Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." An Amendment moved; Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to. Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." The House having agreed that the words stand part of the Question, a Member cannot move a Resolution by way of Amendment.—*Regina v. Overend, Gurney & Co.,* [197] 977, 980

Debate—Motion for Adjournment of the House—Mr. Speaker reminds the House that the privilege of moving the Adjournment of the House upon asking a Question had been reserved by the common consent of the House for occasions of urgency.—*Ireland—Rates on Disturbed Districts,* [196] 19

Debate—Adjournment of the House—A Member who has spoken in the debate cannot move the adjournment of the House.—*Liabilities of Railway Companies,* [194] 1451, 1469; [198] 1439

Debate—Effect of moving or seconding a Motion for the adjournment of a debate—Where

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

a Member has moved the adjournment of the debate, and another Member has seconded it, it is not competent for either the Mover or Seconder of such a Motion immediately to rise and move the adjournment of the House. That must be done by some other voices.—[194] 1469

Debate—Right of Member who has moved the adjournment of a debate—Where an hon. Member has moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House has agreed, that Member has, by the common acceptation of the House, the right of præ-audience when the debate is resumed

When however the House has declined to accede to the Motion, and has divided upon it, the hon. Member who moved it, and had an opportunity to address the House if he chose, has under those circumstances lost the power of addressing the House on the Main Question.—[194] 1470; [196] 1365

Debate—Division of a proposition—The Lords having struck out words in a clause of the *Irish Church Bill*, and inserted other words in their place—Mr. Gladstone moved, "That the House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." Mr. Cross asked whether it was in Order to move that the proposition be divided, and that the Question be put as to the first part, stopping at the word "religion?"—Mr. Speaker said, it was possible to move an Amendment on the proposition before the House; and if the hon. Member moved an Amendment such as he had suggested, it might be done without infringing the Rules of the House.—*Irish Church Bill, Lords Amendments*, [197] 1921

Debate—On Motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the operation and effect of the Game Laws in Scotland, in respect of which several Bills were before the House, Lord Elcho entering into the merits of those measures—Mr. Speaker reminded his Lordship that he had entered into an engagement with the House that he would not enter into the details of these Bills.—*Game Laws (Scotland)*, [195] 1718

Debate—Reference to a speech made in a past Debate in the present Session is not in Order.—*Parliamentary and Municipal Elections*, [194] 1496

Debate—Reference to Debate in the other House—Neither as a point of Privilege nor of Order can a Question referring to language used in the other House of Parliament, be with propriety addressed to the Speaker of this House, [198] 368

Debate—Order—A Member is not in Order in referring to the proceedings of a Committee now Sitting, [197] 1322

Debate — Order in Debate — Lord Claud Hamilton having used strong expressions in reference to the conduct of the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. W. M. Torrens rose to Order, and remarked upon the noble Lord's language in general terms.—Mr Speaker said, that when an hon. Member rose to Order, he was not at liberty to review the general tenor of a Speech, but must object to some definite expression at the moment it is spoken.—*State of Ireland*, [195] 2008

Debate—Motion—Effect of Motion made—A Member who has made a Motion has deprived himself of the power of speaking on it, [197] 1949

Debate—Withdrawal of a Motion—A Resolution having been moved is in the possession of the House, and it is for the House to decide whether it will permit the whole or any part of it to be withdrawn.—*Freedom of Speech—Arrest of Mr. Murphy*, [198] 633

Election Petitions—A Petition complaining of the "illusory character" of the qualification of certain voters of Peebles and Selkirk at the General Election, and praying for a remedy, is not an Election Petition within the Corrupt Practices Act. Sec. 50.—*Faggot Votes in Peeblesshire*, [194] 1185

Instruction—A proposed Instruction to a Committee is not in order when the Committee already possesses the power proposed to be given to it by the Instruction. By a Standing Order of 1854 all Committees have the power to make such Amendments as they deem fit in Bills, provided they are relevant to the subject of the Bill.—*Irish Church Bill*, [195] 847

Questions — Motion for Adjournment of the House on asking a Question—Mr. Speaker reminds the House that the privilege of moving the Adjournment of the House on asking a Question has been reserved by the common consent of the House for occasions of urgency.—*Ireland—Rates on Disturbed Districts*, [196] 19

Special and Common Juries Bill
(*Viscount Enfield, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Denman*)

c. Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 26, [194] 352
Ordered * *June* 10
Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 175]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 21, [198] 398; after short debate, Bill read 2°

Special Bails Bill
(*Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Denman*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 11 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *June* 16
Committee *—R.P. *June* 25
Committee *; Report *June* 28
Considered * *June* 29
Read 3° * *June* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 1
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, [197] 1749; Bill read 2ª (No. 166)
Committee *; Report *July* 20
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 38]

SPENCER, Earl (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland)
Ireland—Religious Disturbances, [197] 1227
St. Patrick, Order of, [197] 1107

STACPOOLE, Mr. W., *Ennis*
Army—Questions, &c.
Ball Ammunition, Possession of, [198] 1292
Cavalry Regiments for India, [198] 154
Courts Martial, [196] 1495
Militia Officers, [196] 749
Relief of Regiments in India, [197] 1421
Rintoul, Captain, Case of, [196] 389
Fisheries—Scotch and Irish, [198] 893
India—Tonk, Nawab of, [194] 310
Ireland—Fenian Convicts—O'Donovan Rossa, [198] 1433
Fisheries, Inspectors of, [194] 830 ;—Commissioners of, 1084
Glebes and Glebe Houses, [198] 1088
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 59, [196] 403
Militia, Comm. [195] 1417
Navy—"Crocodile" Transport, [195] 1197
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [194] 1558
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [194] 993
Submarine Telegraph Cables, [198] 154

Stamp Acts—Consolidation of the
Question, Mr. Crawford ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 2, [195] 30

STANHOPE, Earl
Dublin Freemen Commission, 3R. [198] 1289
Fine Arts Copyright and Consolidation Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [195] 1941
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1346
Infant Life Preservation, 2R. [197] 1739
197] Irish Church, 2R. 98 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 751 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 754 ; *cl.* 27, 1001, 1021 ; *add. cl.* 1259, 1260 ; Report, 1488 ; Amendt. 1490, 1493 ; 3R. Amendt. 1625, 1654
198] Commons Amendts. 292, 435
Life Peerages, 1R. [195] 470, 471 ; Motion for an Address, [196] 10 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1192, 1204 ; Report, 1390 ; 3R. [197] 1393
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 406
Parliament—Construction of the House, Res. [198] 10

STANLEY, Right Hon. Lord, *Lynn Regis*
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 491
Ireland—State of, [195] 1996, 2024, 2025
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 904

STANLEY, Hon. Captain F. A., *Lancashire, N.*
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. [197] 557

STANLEY, Hon. W. O., *Beaumaris*
Sea Birds Preservation, 2R. [194] 775

Stannaries Bill (*Mr. St. Aubyn, Mr. Pendarves Vivian, Mr. Brydges Willyams, Mr. Kekewich*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. St. Aubyn*) *Feb* 26, [194] 399 ; Bill ordered, after short debate ; read 1º* [Bill 24]
Read 2º* *Mar* 12
Committee* ; Report *April* 30 [Bill 101]
Considered* *May* 6
Read 3º* *May* 10
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Portman*) *May* 11 (No. 98)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 1, [196] 1083 ; Bill read 2ª
Committee* *June* 8 (No. 123)
Report* *June* 11
Read 3ª* *June* 14
Royal Assent *June* 24 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 19]

STANSFELD, Right Hon. J. (Lord of the Treasury), *Halifax*
Army—Japan—Officers in, [198] 901
Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1324
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 842 ; *cl.* 5, 844 ; *cl.* 8, 845 ; *cl.* 18, 846, 848, 849 ; *cl.* 24, 853 ; *cl.* 26, 854 ; *cl.* 36, 855 ; *add. cl.* 858
Diplomatic Salaries, &c., Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1336 ; *cl.* 7, 1339
Income Tax, [196] 1238
Land—Transfer of, [194] 2000
Scotland—Salmon Fisheries, [195] 1196
Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1470
Office of Woods, &c. [197] 1704, 1705
Report, [198] 519
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 433 ; Res. 1. (Corn, &c.), 639 ; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 788, 796, 798, 799

STAPLETON, Mr. J., *Berwick-on-Tweed*
County Courts, 2R. [194] 1569 ; [196] 687
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [198] 1273, 1274 ; *cl.* 11, 1279 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1282
Imprisonment for Debt, Comm. *cl.* 5, [197] 577 ; Consid. *cl.* 5, 763 ; Amendt. 764
Ireland—Maynooth, Professors of, [196] 748
Irish Church, Consid. Amendt. [196] 777 ; 3R. 1015
Metropolis—St. James' Park, [196] 12
Œcumenical Council, The, [198] 151
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 802 ; Consid. 1463
Patents for Inventions, Res. [196] 915
Post Office—Postage on Newspapers, [194] 1188
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 959
Representative Peers (Scotland and Ireland), Leave, [194] 984
Ritualistic Processions, [195] 355
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [195] 428 ; Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 785

Statute Law Revision
Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 18, [194] 1653
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 4, To leave out from "That" and add "the Royal Commissions (1833 and 1845), and

[*cont.*

Statut Law Revision—cont.
other measures for the revision of the Statute Law, having occasioned an expenditure of £80,619 *5s.* 1*d.*, and the results being unsatisfactory, it is, in the opinion of this House, expedient to discontinue the present course of proceeding, and the expenditure consequent thereon" (*Mr. Hadfield*), [196] 1244; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 217, N. 64; M. 153

Steam Boilers Inspection Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Vickers, Mr. Brady*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 7
Bill withdrawn * *August* 9 [Bill 64]

Stepney, Colonel J. S. C., *Carmarthen, &c.*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1323
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007

Stevenson, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Durham, University of, [194] 1897
Light Dues, Res. [196] 169
Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1515
Post Office—West India Mails, [196] 15
Shipping Dues in Foreign Ports, [198] 682
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [197] 788

Stipendiary Magistrates (Deputies) Bill
(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Rathbone*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 23 [Bill 176]
Read 2°* *June* 29
Committee*; Report *July* 5
Considered* *July* 6
Read 3°* *July* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Carnarvon*) *July* 9 (No. 179)
Read 2ª* *July* 16
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª* *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 34]

Stone, Mr. W. H., *Portsmouth*
Navy—Government Dockyards, Reductions in the, [194] 377
Post Office—Landing Mails at a Western Port, [196] 936

Stopford, Mr. S. G., *Northamptonshire, N*
Army—British Graves in the Crimea, [196] 17, 747

Stradbroke, Earl of
Ireland—Cork, Mayor of, [196] 76

Straits Settlements Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Granville*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 27 (No. 231)
Read 2ª* *July* 30
Committee*; Report *August* 2
Read 3ª* *August* 3
c. Read 1°* *August* 3 [Bill 259]
Read 2°* *August* 5
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Read 3°* *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 88]

Stratford de Redcliffe, Viscount
Irish Church, 2R. [196] 1695
Life Peerages, Report, [196] 1384
Turco-Persian Boundary, [196] 1
United States—"Alabama" Claims, [196] 1227

Stratheden, Lord
Canning Statue, The, [198] 1484
Parliament—Order in the House, [198] 147

Stronge, Sir J. M., *Armagh Co.*
Ireland—Portadown, Riots at, [197] 1171

Stuart, Colonel J. F. D. C., *Cardiff*
Cardiff Docks—Accidents in the, [194] 739

Suburban Commons Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Mr. Liddell*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 22 [Bill 174]
Read 2°* and committed to the Select Committee on *Metropolitan Commons Act* (1866) *Amendment Bill July* 1
Report of Select Committee *July* 19 (*Parl. P.* No. 334)
Bill withdrawn* *July* 21

Sullivan, Right Hon. E. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Mallow*
Dublin Freemen Commission, Leave, [197] 819, 955; 2R. 1183; Comm. [198] 231, 233
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Bankruptcy Law, [194] 1355
Cashel Election, [195] 977, 1935
Cork, Mayor of, [196] 102
Dublin, Lord Mayor of, [196] 746
Election Petitions, [195] 1096
Fisheries, Inspectors of, [194] 831;—Commissioners of, 1085
Incumbered Estates Court—Earl of Lanesborough's Estate, [195] 520
Jury Panel, Monaghan Assizes, [195] 503; [197] 1343
Ireland—Dublin Election, Motion for a Commission, [195] 1278, 1283
Ireland—Sligo Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 566
194] Irish Church, 2R. 1814
195] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1017, 1022; *cl.* 7, 1100; *cl.* 10, 1103, 1107; *cl.* 13, 1125, 1126, 1136; *cl.* 14, 1142, 1365, 1372, 1382, 1384; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1404, 1406, 1407, 1410; *cl.* 18, 1413, 1479, 1480; *cl.* 19, 1493; *cl.* 20, 1502; *cl.* 22, 1508; *cl.* 23, 1524; *cl.* 25, 1602, 1610; *cl.* 26, 1622, 1625; Amendt. 1627, 1628; *cl.* 27, 1638, 1880; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1881; *cl.* 29, 1914

[*cont.*

Sullivan, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
196] *cl.* 30, 22 ; *cl.* 32, 32 ; *cl.* 33, 53, 54, 59 ; *cl.* 39, 133, 134, 135 ; *cl.* 44, 349 ; *cl.* 52, Amendt. 350 ; *cl.* 61, 421 ; *add. cl.* 424 ; Consid. 756, 767, 768, 772, 777
197] Lords Amendts, 1958, 1960 ; Amendt. 1962, 1975, 1976
198] Amendt. 46, 99
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 186, 243 ; 2R. 575, 582, 584
Parliament—Drogheda Writ, [194] 797
Dublin (City) Election, [194] 1543
Youghal Writ, [195] 2069
Prisoners (Political Offences), Res. [197] 813
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland), Leave, [194] 1543
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 24, [198] 772
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 624

Sunday and Ragged Schools Bill
(*Mr. Charles Reed, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Graves, Mr. M'Arthur*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 8 [Bill 67]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 16, [196] 1959
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*) ; after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 228, N. 71 ; M. 157 ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Committee ; Report, after short debate *June* 22, [197] 464 [Bill 170]
Re-comm. *—R.P. *June* 25
Re-comm. *—R.P. *July* 1
Re-comm.* ; Report *July* 5 [Bill 205]
Considered* *July* 8
Read 3°* *July* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *July* 13
Read 2ª* *July* 19 (No. 188)
Committee* ; Report *July* 20
Read 3ª* *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 26 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 40]

Sunday Trading Bill
(*Mr. Thomas Hughes, Lord Claud Hamilton*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 18 [Bill 5]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 3, [194] 557
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Taylor*) ; after short debate, Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Committee—R.P. *April* 14, [195] 799
Committee—R.P. *June* 9, [196] 1490
Bill withdrawn* *July* 28

Supply—Diplomatic Service, Expenses of
Question, Mr. White ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 8, [194] 836 ; *April* 2, [195] 27

SUPPLY
194] Committee on Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty ;" Queen's Speech referred ; Motion considered ; Resolved, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty" *Feb* 22 ; Resolution, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty," reported, and agreed to *Nem. Con. Feb* 23, 279

Supply—cont.
194] Considered in Committee *Feb* 26, 383—Supplementary Civil Service Estimate 1868-9 £131,844—Resolution—Resolution reported, and, after short debate, agreed to *Mar* 2, 536
Considered in Committee *Mar* 4, 641—Abyssinian Expedition—Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,600,000, be granted, &c." (*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) ; after short debate, Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Sir Patrick O'Brien*), 646 ; after further short debate, Motion withdrawn ; original Question put, and agreed to ; Resolution reported, and agreed to *Mar* 5, 773
Considered in Committee *Mar* 5, 770—Deficiencies : Post Office Packet Service £6,989 0*s.* 6*d.*—Excesses on Grants, Civil Service Estimates £400,894 7*s.* 4*d.*—Resolutions reported *Mar* 8
Considered in Committee *Mar* 8, 863—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *Mar* 9
Considered in Committee *Mar* 11, 1111—Army Estimates—Resolutions reported *Mar* 12
195] Considered in Committee *April* 2, 52—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *April* 5
Considered in Committee *April* 5, 181—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *April* 6
Considered in Committee *April* 9, 522—Civil Service Estimates—£1,586,800 on Account—Resolution reported *April* 12
Considered in Committee *April* 12, 660—Army Estimates—Resolutions reported *April* 13
Considered in Committee *May* 10—Civil Service Estimates—£1,583,300 further on Account—Resolution reported *May* 11
196] Considered in Committee—Army Estimates *June* 10, 1573 ; Resolutions reported *June* 11
197] Considered in Committee *June* 17, 143—Army Estimates—Resolutions reported *June* 18
The Education Votes, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *June* 24, 515
Considered in Committee *June* 28, 652—Civil Service Estimates—Resolutions reported *July* 8
Considered in Committee *July* 5, 1200—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported *July* 6
Considered in Committee *July* 8, 1456—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported *July* 9
Considered in Committee *July* 12, 1677—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported ;
198] and, after short debate, agreed to *July* 22, 515
Considered in Committee *July* 19, 163—Civil Service Estimates—Resolutions reported *July* 22
Considered in Committee *July* 22, 498—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported ; and, after debate, agreed to *July* 26, 686
Considered in Committee *July* 26, 727—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported *July* 27
Considered in Committee *July* 29, 908—Civil Service Estimates — Resolutions reported *July* 30
Considered in Committee *July* 30, 997—Supplementary Civil Service Estimates—Telegraphic Services—Greenwich Hospital—Resolutions reported *July* 31 [*cont.*

Supply—cont.

SUPPLEMENTAL VOTES

SUPPLIES (DEFICIENCIES), 1867-8.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 8—REPORT *Mar* 9

	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
Navy Services	366,545	5	6

CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:

COMMITTEE *Mar* 5—REPORT *Mar* 8

CLASS I.	£	s.	d.
Royal Palaces	7,704	2	2
British Embassy Houses, Paris and Madrid	2,048	10	9
Public Record Repository ...	2,363	14	6
British Consulate and Embassy Houses, Constantinople ...	334	15	5

CLASS II.			
Office of Works and Public Buildings	780	19	2
Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues (1866-7 and 1867-8)	1,494	18	3
Inspectors of Factories, Fisheries, &c.	7,355	12	3
Household of Lord Lieutenant, Ireland	1,377	11	10
Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices...	1,874	7	11
Superintendent of Roads, South Wales	122	7	2
Landed Estates Record Offices ...	177	4	11
Printing and Stationery	8,468	9	10

CLASS III.			
Law Charges, England	458	10	2
Criminal Prosecutions, &c. ...	22,234	18	1
Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain	196,136	14	7
Probate Court	10,803	12	11
County Courts	66,288	1	4
Land Registry Office	89	3	8
Court of Chancery, Ireland ...	7,302	7	0
Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, Ireland	6,444	3	3
Officers of the Judges on Circuit, Ireland	2,202	16	0
Registry of Judgments, Ireland ...	373	1	10
Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency, Ireland	534	19	4
Court of Probate, Ireland ...	1,461	7	7
Landed Estates Court, Ireland ...	2,689	11	8
Dublin Metropolitan Police and Police Justices, Ireland ...	803	1	9
Maintenance of Prisoners in County Gaols, &c., and removal of convicts	4,712	11	7
Convict Establishments in the Colonies	15,180	6	4

CLASS IV.			
Royal Irish Academy	61	10	0
Belfast Theological Professors ...	144	1	9

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

CLASS V.	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
Governors and others, West Indies, &c.	1,504	18	3
Treasury Chest	2,303	13	3
Ministers at Foreign Courts, Extraordinary Expenses ...	5,384	16	9
Special Missions, Outfits, &c. ...	4,741	6	0

CLASS VI.			
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	547	11	7
Relief of distressed British seamen	2,787	5	0
Nonconforming and other Ministers, Ireland	2,690	3	0

CLASS VII.			
Temporary Commissions ...	3,357	16	11
Flax Cultivation in Ireland ...	500	0	0
Miscellaneous Expenses formerly Civil Contingencies	5,053	3	7
Total	£400,894	7	4

COMMITTEE *Mar* 5—REPORT *Mar* 8

Post Office Packet Service ...	6,989	0	6

After short debate, Vote agreed to [194] 770

SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS, 1868-9

COMMITTEE *Mar* 4—REPORT *Mar* 5

	£
Expedition to Abyssinia [194] 641	3,600,000

After debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *Feb* 26—REPORT *Mar* 2

CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:

CLASS I.	
Public Buildings	11,738
University of London—Buildings ...	5,000

CLASS II.	
Printing and Stationery	18,000

CLASS III.	
Law Charges, England	10,000
Criminal Prosecutions, Sheriffs Expenses, &c.	12,000
Common Law Courts, England ...	10,000
County Prisons and Reformatories, &c., Great Britain	10,000
Common Law Courts, Ireland ...	2,000
Criminal Proceedings, Scotland ...	5,000
Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland...	1,000
Constabulary of Ireland	17,200

CLASS V.	
Livingstone Search Expedition ...	1,906
Compensation to Abyssinian Captives	9,000

[*cont.*

Supply—cont

CLASS VI.	Total of Vote.
Superannuations and Retired Allowances	£ 19,000
Total	£131,844

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1869-70.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 8—REPORT *Mar* 9

63,300 Men and Boys—Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Childers) on moving a Resolution "That 63,000 Men and Boys be employed for the Sea and Coastguard Service for the year ending 31st March, 1870, including 14,000 Royal Marines" *Mar* 8, [194] 863; after long debate, Vote agreed to	*Numbers.* 63, 000

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1869-70.	Total of Vote. £
(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines..	2,762,353
(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto...	1,172,268
After short debate, Vote agreed to [194] 932	
COMMITTEE *April* 2—REPORT *April* 5	
(3.) Admiralty Office	168,704
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £168,704, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £168,204, &c." (*Sir James Elphinstone*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [195] 52	
(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and Royal Naval Reserve ... [195] 83	224,073
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(5.) Scientific Branch	62,820
(6.) Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad	1,086,004
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,086,004, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,056,004, &c." (*Mr. Corry*); after debate, A. 46, N. 122; M. 67; Vote agreed to [195] 99	
COMMITTEE *April* 5—REPORT *April* 6	
(7.) Victualling Yards and Transport Establishments at Home and Abroad ... [195] 181	80,671
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad ... ... [195] 185	54,757
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) Marine Divisions [195] 185	16,566
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery, and Ships built by Contract:	
Section I. Naval Stores ...	£ 801,572
After short debate, Vote agreed to [195] 187	
Section II. Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract	767,070
After debate, Vote agreed to [195] 193	
(11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs [195] 210	749,816
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ..	79,300
(13.) Martial Law and Law Charges	18,144
(14.) Miscellaneous Services	120,650
Total for the Effective Service ...	8,164,768
(15.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines [195] 216	£ 723,231
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances:	
Section I. Military Pensions and Allowances	569,728
Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances	222,566
Total for the Naval Service ...	9,680,293
FOR THE SERVICE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT.	
(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops)	£ 316,348
Grand Total ...	£9,996,641

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1869-70.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 11—REPORT *Mar* 12

Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Cardwell*) on moving Resolution (A), "That the number of Land Forces for the service of the year ending the 31st March 1869-70 be fixed at 127,366 men, together with 1,760 Native Indian Troops" *Mar* 11 [194] 1111

After long debate, Vote agreed to

NUMBERS.	*Numbers.*
(A.) General Staff, Regimental and Military Educational Establishments (Average Numbers) ...	125,529
(B.) Native Indian Troops	1,760

I.—REGULAR FORCES.	Total of Vote. £
(1.) General Staff and Regimental Pay, Allowances, and Charges ...	5,313,800
(2.) Commissariat Establishment, Services, Movement of Troops, &c.	1,185,600
COMMITTEE *April* 12—REPORT *April* 13	
(3.) Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies	460,800
(4.) Barrack Establishments, Services, and Supplies	512,900

[*cont.*

[*cont*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(5.) Divine Service £43,800
(6.) Administration of Martial Law ... 2,000
(7.) Hospital Establishment, Services, and Supplies [195] 666 366,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to

II.—Reserve Forces.

(8.) Militia and Inspection of Reserve Forces
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £952,700, be granted, &c.;" after short debate, Motion withdrawn [196] 667

Committee *June* 10—Report *June* 11

Militia and Inspection of Reserve Forces ... [196] 1573 952,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(9.) Yeomanry Cavalry
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £89,300, be granted, &c.;" after short debate, A. 117, N. 27; M. 90; Vote agreed to 89,300
(10.) Volunteer Corps 414,000
(11.) Army Reserve Force (including Enrolled Pensioners) 81,200

III.—Stores.

ommittee *April* 12—Report *April* 13

(13.) (including 12) Military Store Departments for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, including manufacturing Departments ... [195] 668 1,150,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to

IV.—Works and Buildings.

(14.) Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad ... [195] 669 884,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to

V.—Various Services.

Committee *June* 17—Report *June* 18

(15.) Establishments for Military Education ... [197] 143 158,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(16.) Surveys of the United Kingdom 118,500
(17.) Miscellaneous Services ... 90,600
(18.) Administration of the Army ... 223,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 143

Total Effective Services £12,047,600

VI.—Non-Effective Services.

(19.) Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c. ... ... £ 27,000
(20.) Pay of General Officers [197] 149 73,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(21.) Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half-pay 480,500
(22.) Widows' Pensions, &c. ... 156,400
(23.) Pensions for Wounds ... 22,300

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(24.) Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions) ... [197] 149 £ 34,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(25.) Out-Pensions 1,239,300
(26.) Superannuation Allowances ... 132,000
After short debate, Vote postponed [197] 149
(27.) Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps 17,900

Total Non-Effective Services £2,182,800

Recapitulation.

Effective Services 12,047,600
Non-Effective Services ... 2.182,800
Amount Written off as Irrecoverable ... ... —
Total Effective and Non-Effective Services £14,230,400

Exchequer Bonds ... ... £ 3,300,000

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1869-70.

⁂ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

Committee *June* 28—Report *July* 8. Total of Vote.

Great Britain: £

(1.) †£36,418, Royal Palaces ... 54,418
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 652
(2.) †£84,887, Royal Parks ... 128,825
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £84,887, be granted, &c." [197] 654
Moved, "That the Item of £52, for the Gatekeeper at Clarence Gate, Roehampton, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. A. Guest*); after debate, agreed to
Original Question, as amended, proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £84,825, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £56,000, &c." (*Mr. Goldney*); after debate, A. 42, N. 98; M. 56 [197] 665
Original Question, as amended, again proposed
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £71,700, &c." (*Mr. Cawley*), negatived; original Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
(3.) †£82,479, Public Buildings ... 122,479
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £82,479, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £20,220, for fuel and light, be reduced by the sum of £1,320" (*Mr. Candlish*); after debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [197] 675
(4.) †£10,000, Furniture of Public Offices 14,000

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000, be granted, &c." [197] 676 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000, &c." (*Mr. Brogden*); after short debate, A. 52, N. 112; M. 60; Vote agreed to	
(5.) † £17,000, Westminster Palace, Acquisition of Land [197] 679 After short debate, Vote agreed to	25,000
(6.) † £34,026, Houses of Parliament Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £34,026, be granted, &c." [197] 679 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £32,805, &c." (*Mr. Monk*); after debate, A. 51, N. 129; M. 78 Original Question again proposed Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,526, &c." (*Mr. White*); after short debate, Motion negatived Original Question again proposed Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,526, &c." (*Mr. Locke King*); after further short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	47,026

COMMITTEE *July* 5—REPORT *July* 6

(7.) † £40,000, Public Offices Site ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1200	48,000
(8.) † £22,000, New Home and Colonial Offices	32,000
(9.) † £20,000, Public Record Repository	30,000
(10.) † £2,435, Chapter House, Westminster ... [197] 1209 After short debate, Vote agreed to	3,635
(11.) † £5,264, Probate Court and Registries ... [197] 1210 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,264, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,026, &c." (*Mr. Monk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn Original Question again proposed Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,764," &c. (*Mr. W. Cowper*); after further short debate, A. 66, N. 137; M. 71; Vote agreed to	8,264
(12.) † £19,048, Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland	29,048
(13.) † £46,000, National Gallery Enlargement	55,000
(14.) † £20,000, University of London (Buildings)	30,000
(15.) † £13,000, Glasgow University	20,000
(16.) † £7,000, Edinburgh Industrial Museum ... [197] 1212 After short debate, Vote agreed to	10,000
(17.) † £54,834, Burlington House ... Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £54,834, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,834, &c." (*Mr. Goldney*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn Original Question again proposed Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £48,640, &c." (*Mr. Goldney*); A. 79, N. 118; M. 39; Vote agreed to	64,834

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
COMMITTEE *July* 8—REPORT *July* 9	
(18.) † £91,045, Post Office and Inland Revenue Buildings [197] 1456 After short debate, Vote agreed to	135,045
(19.) † £58,475, Harbours of Refuge After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1456	69,475
(20.) † £3,300, Portland Harbour ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1457	5,300
(21.) † £7,000, Metropolitan Fire Brigade	10,000
(22.) † £19,839, Rates on Government Property ... [197] 1457 After short debate, Vote agreed to	29,839
(23.) † £1,880, Wellington Monument	2,800
(24.) † £267, Palmerston Monument ...	667

IRELAND :

(25.) † £95,455, Public Buildings ... Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £95,455, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £87,667, &c." (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [197] 1460	145,455
(26.) † £2,362, Ulster Canal ...	3,362

ABROAD :

(27.) † £26,810, Lighthouses Abroad After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1463	31,810
(28.) † £687, Embassy Houses, Paris and Madrid ... ... Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £687, be granted, &c." Moved, "That the Item of £185 for Salary of Clerk of the Works, &c., be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Hibbert*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [197] 1466	1,887
(29.) † £37,583, Embassy Houses and Consular Buildings, Constantinople, China, Japan, and Tehran ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1468	52,585
Total Civil Services Class I. ...	£1,210,754

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

ENGLAND :

COMMITTEE *July* 8—REPORT *July* 9	£
(1.) † £31,438, House of Lords' Offices After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1474	46,438
(2.) † £36,482, House of Commons' Offices ... [197] 1476 After short debate, Vote agreed to	54,482
(3.) † £39,275, Treasury and Subordinate Departments [197] 1478 After short debate, Vote agreed to	59,275
(4.) † £57,696, Home Office and subordinate Departments [197] 1480 After short debate, Vote agreed to	85,696

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
COMMITTEE *July* 12—REPORT *July* 22	
(5.) † £47,413, Foreign Office ...	70,413
After debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1677	
(6.) † £23,884, Colonial Office ...	34,884
(7.) † £27,413, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments ...	41,413
(8.) † £68,033, Board of Trade and Subordinate Departments ...	101,033
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1680	
(9.) † £1,921, Privy Seal Office ...	2,921
(10.) † £13,265, Charity Commission	19,265
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1683	
(11.) † £6,694, Civil Service Commission	9,694
(12.) † £13,281, Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission [197] 1684	20,281
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(13.) † £7,000, Copyhold, Inclosure, and Drainage Acts Expenses ...	11,000
(14.) † £25,324, Exchequer and Audit Department	37,324
(15.) † £28,060, General Register Office	42,060
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1684	
(16.) † £3,000, Lunacy Commission ...	5,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1685	
(17.) † £30, 550, Mint	45,550
(18.) † £11,110, National Debt Office	16,110
(19.) † £23,669, Patent Office ...	34,669
After short debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1685	
(20.) † £13,417, Paymaster General's Office	20,417
(21.) † £176,762, Poor Law Commission ... ... [197] 1686	211,762
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(22.) † £14,624, Public Record Office	22,624
After debate, Vote agreed to [197] 1693	
(23.) † £3,009, Public Works Loan Commission	4,509
(24.) † £1,684, Registrars of Friendly Societies	2,484
(25.) † £264,135, Stationery Office and Printing	412,635
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £264,135, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £263,185, &c." (*Mr. Miller*); after short debate, A. 35, N. 110; M. 75; Vote agreed to ... [197] 1693	
(26.) † £18,227, Woods, Forests, &c., Office of	27,227
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,227, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,084, &c." (*Sir Patrick O'Brien*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [197] 1701	
(27.) † £18,722, Works and Public Buildings, Office of	34,222
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,722, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £16,722, &c." (*Mr. Craufurd*); after debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to ... [197] 1705	
(28.) † £18,000, Secret Service ...	27,000
	[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
SCOTLAND:	
(29.) † £4,317, Exchequer and other Offices	6,317
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,317, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item of £217 13*s.* for Queen's Plates be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after debate, A. 73, N. 191; M. 118; Vote agreed to ... [197] 1710	
COMMITTEE *July* 22—REPORT *July* 26	
(30.) † £9,298, Fishery Board ...	13,298
Amendt. to leave out £9,298, and insert £3,531 6*s.* 7*d.* (*Mr. Craufurd*); Question put, "That £9,298 stand part of the said Resolution;" A. 150, N. 45; M. 105	
(31.) † £5,391, General Register Office	7,391
(32.) † £4,166, Lunacy Commission ...	6,166
(33.) † £9,838, Poor Law Commission	17,838
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 507	
IRELAND:	
(34.) † £3,664, Lord Lieutenant's Household ... [198] 508	6,164
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,664, be granted, &c." [198] 508	
Moved, "That the Item of £1,562 6*s.* 2*d.* for Queen's Plates be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Rylands*); after debate, A. 59, N. 79; M. 20; after debate, Vote agreed to	
(35.) † £15,453, Chief Secretary's Office	23,453
(36.) † £100, Boundary Survey ...	500
(37.) † £1,238, Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	2,238
(38.) † £13,722, General Register Office	20,722
(39.) † £65,328, Poor Law Commission	97,328
(40.) † £3,182, Public Record Office ...	4,682
COMMITTEE *July* 26—REPORT *July* 27	
(41.) † £18,196, Public Works Office ...	27,196
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,196, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,609, &c." (*Mr. Blake*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [198] 742	
Total Civil Services Class II. ...	£1,733,681
CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.	
COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30	
ENGLAND:	
(1.) † £27,835, Law Charges ...	41,835
(2.) † £116,973, Criminal Prosecutions	199,973
(3.) † £45,242, Common Law Courts	67,242
	[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
(4.) † £325,575, County Courts ...	487,575
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 909	
(5.) † £61,733, Probate Court ...	91,733
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 909	
(6.) † £8,870, Admiralty Court Registry	13,870
(7.) † £3,490, Land Registry Office...	5,490
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 910	
(8.) † £21,224, Police Courts (London and Sheerness)	32,224
(9.) † £141,449, Metropolitan Police	211,449
(10.) † £235,000, County and Borough Police, Great Britain	282,000
(11.) † £208,712, Government Prisons, England, and Transportation ...	322,712
(12.) † £175,632, County Prisons and Reformatories, Great Britain ...	282,632
(13.) † £21,910, Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	32,910
(14.) † £14,335, Miscellaneous Legal Charges	21,335
SCOTLAND:	
(15.) † £50,198, Criminal Proceedings	75,198
(16.) † £36,764, Courts of Law and Justice	54,764
(17.) † £15,099, Register House Departments	22,099
(18.) † £16,949, Prisons	24,949
IRELAND:	
(19.) † £58,364, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	87,364
(20.) † £29,379, Court of Chancery ...	44,379
(21.) † £20,097, Common Law Courts	30,097
(22.) † £5,510, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency	8,510
(23.) † £9,003, Landed Estates Court	13,003
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 911	
(24.) † £7,380, Probate Court ...	11,380
(25.) † £1,130, Admiralty Court Registry ... ... [198] 911	2,130
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(26.) † £9,857, Registry of Deeds ...	14,857
(27.) † £2,262, Registry of Judgments	3,262
(28.) † £65,043, Dublin Metropolitan Police ... [198] 912	97,043
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(29.) † £603,544, Constabulary ...	905,544
(30.) † £14,193, Government Prisons and Reformatories	71,193
(31.) † £6,000, County Prisons ...	9,000
(32.) † £3,272, Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum ...[198] 913	4,872
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(33.) † £1,730, Four Courts Marshalsea Prison ... [198] 913	2,530
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(34.) † £5,820, Miscellaneous Legal Charges	8,820
ABROAD:	
(35.) † £85,452, Convict Establishments in the Colonies	128,452

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.	
COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31	
	£
† £5,000, Common Law Courts (England)... ... [198] 1002	5,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
† £5,000, Military Prisoners ...	5,000
Court of Chancery	88,500
Court of Bankruptcy	49,50
Total Civil Services Class III. ...	£3,860,426
CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.	
COMMITTEE *July* 19—REPORT *July* 22	
GREAT BRITAIN:	£
(1.) † £560,711, Public Education...	840,711
After long debate, Vote agreed to [198] 163	
(2.) † £158,253, Science and Art Department ... [198] 200	232,253
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(3.) † £75,203, British Museum ...	113,203
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 219	
(4.) † £10,978, National Gallery	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,978, be granted, &c."	
After debate, Committee—R.P.	
COMMITTEE *July* 22—REPORT *July* 26	
Question again proposed; after debate, Vote agreed to [198] 498	15,978
(5.) † £1,110, National Portrait Gallery	1,710
(6.) † £8,300, Learned Societies ...	12,300
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,300, be granted, &c." [198] 503	
Moved, "That the Item of £500 for the Royal Academy of Music be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Monk*); after debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £6,449, University of London...	9,449
(8.) † £12,337, Universities, &c., in Scotland	18,337
(9.) † £2,100, Board of Manufactures, Scotland ... [198] 506	3,100
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
IRELAND:	
COMMITTEE *July* 26—REPORT *July* 27	
(10.) † £191,950, Public Education ...	373,950
After debate, Vote agreed to [198] 727	
(11.) † £530, Commissioners of Education (Endowed Schools)	730
COMMITTEE *July* 22—REPORT *July* 26	
(12.) † £1,240, National Gallery ...	2,240
(13.) † £1,084, Royal Irish Academy	1,684
(14.) † £1,710, Queen's University ...	3,210
(15.) † £2,865, Queen's Colleges ...	4,265
(16.) † £1,250, Belfast Theological Professors, &c.	2,050

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31 £
† £1,200, Science and Art Department 1,200
Endowed Schools, England, Commission 8,000

Total Civil Services Class IV. ... £1,644,370

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30
(1.) † £155,667, Diplomatic Services 233,367
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £155,667, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £145,667, &c." (*Mr. Rylands*); after long debate, A. 66, N. 66; The Chairman declaring himself with the Noes; original Question again proposed; and, after further debate, agreed to ... [198] 913
(2.) † £174,451, Consular Services ... 261,451
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 952
(3.) † £46,298, Colonies, Grants in Aid ... ... [198] 952 68,298
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(4.) † £3,134, Orange River Territory and St. Helena 4,134
(5.) † £5,360, Slave Trade, Commissions for Suppression of ... 7,360
(6.) † £23,343, Tonnage Bounties, &c. 35,343
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 960
(7.) † £9,500, Emigration [198] 962 13,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(8.) † £500, Coolie Emigration ... 700
(9.) † £9,047, Treasury Chest ... 19,047

Total Civil Services Class V. ... £643,200

CLASS VI. — SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30
(1.) † £171,877, Superannuation and Retired Allowances ... [198] 963 290,377
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(2.) † £31,600, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c. 47,600
(3.) † £30,400, Relief of Distressed British Seamen [198] 965 45,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(4.) † £27,320, Non-conforming Clergy, Ireland ... [198] 966 41,320
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(5.) † £13,045, Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland 19,045
(6.) † £4,825, Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c., Great Britain ... 6,825
(7.) † £4,834, Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c., Ireland 6,834

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31 £
† £30,000, Superannuations and Retired Allowances 30,000

Total Civil Services Class VI. ... £487,401

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30
(1.) † £31,000, Temporary Commissions ... ... [198] 966 46,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(2.) † £31,147, Local Dues on Shipping 46,147
(3.) † £380, Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c. 780
(4.) † £2,000, Flax Cultivation, Ireland ... ... [198] 968 3,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(5.) † £23,247, Miscellaneous Expenses 35,247
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,247, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,804 6*s*., &c." (*Mr. Fawcett*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to [198] 968

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31
† £4,500, Miscellaneous Expenses ... 4,500

Total Civil Services Class VII. ... £135,674

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1869-70.

COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31 £
Vote I. Customs (Salaries and Expenses) 1,008,343
Vote II. Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses) 1,604,616
Vote III. Post Office Services ... 2,362,841
After short debate, Vote agreed to [198] 1001
Telegraph Service 90,000

Total of Revenue Departments... £5,065,800

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

COMMITTEE *July* 30—REPORT *July* 31
† £709,780, POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE ... ... [198] 1101 £ 1,089,780
After short debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *June* 10—REPORT *June* 11
NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE AND OFFICES (Purchase of Site) ... [196] 1577 £ 14,093
After short debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *June* 10—REPORT *June* 11
GREENWICH HOSPITAL—For six months ending 30th September ... ... £ 64,479
After short debate, Vote agreed to [196] 1577
COMMITTEE *July* 30
REPORT *July* 31
For six months ending 31st March, 1870 68,118
£132,597

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

SCHEDULE OF WAYS AND MEANS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 5 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION ACT—viz.:

	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 1. s. 1. for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1868 and 1869	4,506,272	13	4
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1870—viz.:			
Per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 1. s. 2	3,900,000	0	0
Per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 8 ...	17,100,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	21,746,684	2	3
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	798,132	17	9
TOTAL GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS to meet the following Supplies:—			
1868-9 £4,506,272 13 4 1869-70 43,544,817 0 0	£48,051,089	13	4

Supply—cont.

SUMMARY.

SUMS VOTED IN SUPPLY, SESSION 1869.

1867-8—(Deficiencies.)		£	s.	d.
NAVY SERVICES		366,545	5	6
CIVIL SERVICES		400,894	7	4
POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE		6,989	0	6
1868-9—(Supplemental.)				
EXPEDITION TO ABYSSINIA ...		3,600,000	0	0
CIVIL SERVICES		131,844	0	0
1869-70				
NAVY SERVICES		9,996,641	0	0
ARMY SERVICES		14,230,400	0	0
EXCHEQUER BONDS		3,300,000	0	0
CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:	£			
I. Public Works and Buildings	1,210,754			
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments...	1,733,681			
III. Law and Justice	3,860,426			
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	1,644,370			
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	643,200			
VI. Superannuation, &c.	487,401			
VII. Miscellaneous	135,674			
		9,715,506	0	0
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS		5,065,800	0	0
POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE		1,089,780	0	0
ADVANCES FOR NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE AND OFFICES		14,093	0	0
ADVANCES FOR GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND SCHOOL		132,597	0	0
TOTAL OF SUPPLIES CHARGEABLE UPON THE ABOVE WAYS AND MEANS—		£48,051,089	13	4

SYDNEY, Viscount (Lord Chamberlain)
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, Her Majesty's Answer, [194] 283

SYKES, Colonel W. H., *Aberdeen City*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1434
Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), Leave, [194] 283
Army—Cartridge-making, [194] 410
  Mauritius—Troops at the, [196] 1590
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1566
Bayswater Market and Baths, 2R. [194] 542
Canada (Rupert's Land) Loan, 2R. [198] 1334
China—Hong Kong Gambling Houses, [197] 1667
  Hostilities to Foreigners, [195] 577
  Pekin—Affair at, [197] 625
China—Tien-Tsin, Treaty of, Motion for Papers, [197] 1779
Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, Res. [195] 491
Civil Offices (Pensions), Comm. [196] 868; *cl.* 3, 871; *cl.* 4, 874
Colonial Returns, [196] 470
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, [197] 1289; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1294; *cl.* 63, 1532; *cl.* 101, 1764; *add. cl.* 1770

[*cont.*

SYKES, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 36, [196] 855
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1747
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1005
India—Azeem Jah, Prince, [198] 1090
  Indian Field Officers, [195] 1
  Indian Officers, Return of, [194] 204
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1195
Metropolis Gas Bills, [194] 303
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 343; 3R. 1342
Navy—African Squadron, Motion for Returns, [195] 44
  Greenwich Sixpence, [195] 1853
  Instructions to Officers on Foreign Stations, [194] 1353, 1354
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 913
  Salaries, [195] 65
Parliament—Returns, [194] 111
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. [198] 805; *cl.* 1, 822; *cl.* 2, 833, 1112; *cl.* 4, 1113; Consid. 1464
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1588
Supply—Colonies, Grants in Aid, [198] 958
  Common Law Courts, [198] 1002

[*cont.*

SYKES, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1469
Education, Public, [198] 199
Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 927
Embassy Houses Abroad, [197] 1467
Foreign Office, [197] 1679
Furniture, Public Departments, [197] 677
House of Lords Offices, [197] 1475
Industrial Museum, Edinburgh, [197] 1213
Public Buildings, [197] 676
Public Works (Ireland) (Salaries), [198] 745, 746
Royal Parks, &c. [197] 665
Stationery Office, [197] 1697
Tonnage Bounties, [198] 961
Works, &c. [197] 1708
Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 219

SYKES, Mr. C., *Yorkshire, E.R.*
British Columbia—Motion for Papers, [196] 1105
Sea Birds Preservation, Leave, [194] 404; 2R. 775; Consid. *add. cl.* [195] 557

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Ireland—O'Sullivan, Mr., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1164
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 2, [195] 1041; *cl.* 14, 1150; *cl.* 15, 1400; *cl.* 25, 1615; *cl.* 32, [196] 41; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 53, 55; *cl.* 59, 400; Lords Amendts. [198] 71; Amendt. 98
Medical Officers Superannuation (Ireland), 2R. [197] 490
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 239
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [195] 321
Poor Law (Removal of Children), Res. [197] 1340
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1926
Sheep and Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [194] 205
Supply—Education, Public, [198] 735

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Kent, W.*
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 10, [198] 1279
Irish Church, 3R. [196] 1019
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Comm. Amendt. [198] 357
Metropolis—Cremorne Gardens, [196] 1743
Parliament—Mosaics in the Houses of Parliament, [198] 448
Whitsuntide Holidays, [196] 104
Poor Law—Kensington Sick Asylum District, [195] 841
Railway Guards and Passengers Communication, [198] 1088, 1089
Supply—Lord Lieutenant's Household, [198] 513, 514
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 791

Tasmania, Public Worship
Question, Mr. C. Reed; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 11, [194] 1085

TAUNTON, Lord
Endowed Schools, 2R. [197] 616
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 28, [197] 1025; *cl.* 68, 1237; Report, 1493
Parliament—Order in the House, [197] 406

TAYLOR, Right Hon. Colonel T. E., *Dublin Co.*
Dublin Freemen, Leave, Motion for Adjournment, [197] 820
Parliament—Drogheda Writ, [194] 151, 797

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester*
Army—Lunatics—Murder of Sergeant Barnes, &c. [195] 1576
Conviction of three Children at Salisbury, [195] 675; [196] 1608
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. Amendt. [198] 1004
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1730
Italy—Nathan, Mr., Arrest of, [198] 1526
Loan Societies, [194] 1086
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 670
Poor Law—Vagrants in Sacks, Narberth Union, [197] 308, 1890
South Sea Islands—Slave Trade from the, [197] 633; [198] 450
Sunday Trading, 2R. Amendt. [194] 561; Comm. [195] 799, 802

Telegraph Bill *Formerly* }
Electric Telegraphs Bill }
(*Mr. Dodson, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 15, [195] 845
Considered in Committee *July* 5, [197] 1214; Resolutions agreed to
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 6 [Bill 197]
Read 2°* *July* 16
198] Select Committee to consist of the Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hunt, and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection *July* 19, 234
Report of Select Committee* *July* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 348)
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *July* 26, 746
. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee, to examine and take evidence upon the Contracts entered into with the several Telegraphic, Railway, and Canal Companies, with a view to determine whether they are of the character of fraudulent or of improvident Contracts contemplated in the Resolution of this House of the 24th day of July 1860; and to examine the calculations upon which the Estimates of Receipt and Expenditure, as set forth in the Reports of Mr. Scudamore and in the Statement of the Postmaster General when submitting Resolutions upon this subject, are based, with a view to determine whether there is any reasonable prospect that said Estimates may be realized" (*Mr. Robert Torrens*), 751; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 148, N. 23; M. 125; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee; Report [Bill 233]
. Considered; after short debate, Bill read 3° *July* 29, 974

[*cont.*

Telegraph Bill—cont.
198] *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *July* 30 (No. 243)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" . *August* 3, 1135; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 73]

Tenants Purchase by Instalments (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Dunsany*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 1 (No. 161)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 27, [198] 773; after short debate, Motion and Bill withdrawn

Tenure (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 5 (No. 36)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 20, [195] 1157; Bill read 2ª, after debate
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *April* 26, 1536; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That the Order for the House to be put into Committee be discharged" *July* 27, [198] 776; Order discharged

Thames Embankment, Proposed Viaduct
(See *Metropolis*—Title, *Thames Embankment*)

THYNNE, Lord H. F., *Wiltshire, S.*
Corrupt Practices Commissions, [195] 1975
Episcopal Clergy, Disabilities of the, [195] 1466

TIPPING, Mr. W., *Stockport*
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 862
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 63, [197] 1533

TITE, Sir W., *Bath*
Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1245
Courts of Justice (New Site), Leave, [196] 560
Metropolis—Finsbury Park, [196] 741
Thames Embankment, South Side, [195] 1464
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, Motion for a Committee, [194] 277
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 337; Comm. *add. cl.* 1057, 1059; 3R. 1342
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Res. [195] 273, 279, 302
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [197] 1436

Titles of Religious Congregations Act Extension Bill (*Mr. Headlam, Mr. Pease*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 127]
Read 2° * *June* 7
Committee *; Report *June* 11 [Bill 156]
Read 3° * *June* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Saint Albans*) *June* 15
Read 2ª * *July* 2 (No. 130)
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 6
Royal Assent *July* 12 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 26]

Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Act (1868) Amendment Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 144]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 28 [Bill 182]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 22
Read 3° * *July* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 26
Read 2ª * *August* 6 (No. 227)
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 116]

TOLLEMACHE, Mr. J., *Cheshire, W.*
Cattle Disease (Cheshire), Res. [197] 1811

TORRENS, Mr. R. R., *Cambridge Bo.*
Assessed Rates, 2R. [196] 1327; Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 527
Malta, Res. [197] 1774, 1779
New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 489
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Motion for a Committee, [194] 657; Instruction to Committee, 1511
Telegraph, Comm. Amendt. [198] 751; *cl.* 12, 771

TORRENS, Mr. W. M., *Finsbury*
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [198] 877
Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 956
Extradition, Law of, [194] 1462
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1794
Ireland—Incumbered Estates Court—Earl of Lanesborough's Estate, [195] 521
State of, [195] 2007, 2008
Irish Church, Lords Amendts. [198] 79
Marlborough Street Police Court, Motion for Papers, [198] 1229
Metropolis—Finsbury Park, [196] 740
Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans), 2R. [198] 338; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1056; *add. cl.* 1057, 1060; Consid. 1128, 1131; 3R. 1335, 1338, 1339, 1340
Metropolitan Poor Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [196] 963, 1340
Poor Law — Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, [195] 1354
Sick Poor Asylums, [194] 954
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [197] 672
Treasury, &c. Departments, [197] 1479
Telegraph, Consid. Amendt. [198] 974
United States—"Alabama" Claims, [194] 309
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, [196] 620, 627

TOWNSHEND, Marquess of
Aggravated Assaults Amendment, 2R. [196] 564, 565
Children, &c. Protection, 2R. [197] 1864
Education of Children, 2R. [197] 1738
Industrial Schools (Great Britain), 2R. [196] 353
Infant Life Preservation, 2R. [197] 1739, 1740
Lodgers Property Protection, 2R. [196] 562
Poor in England and Wales, Address for a Commission, [197] 399
Reformatory Schools Amendment, 2R. [196] 351, 352

TRACY, Hon. C. R. D. HANBURY- *Montgomery, &c.*
Army—Military Labour, Res. [195] 642 ; [196] 1209 ; [198] 684
Navy Estimates — Coastguard Service, [195] 94, 95
Navy—Royal Naval Reserve, [194] 484

Trade Marks Registration Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Considered in Committee ; Resolution reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *May* 13 [Bill 126]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 16

Trade Returns from Public Departments
Question, Mr. Pochin ; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 12, [195] 575

Trades Unions
Funds of, Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Hadfield ; Answers, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 18, [194] 112
Report of Commission, Observations, Mr. Serjeant Cox ; Reply, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 26, [194] 366
Eleventh Report—*Parl. P.* [4123]
(See title *Friendly Societies*)

Trades Unions, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 68]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 7, [197] 1344 ; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn* *July* 12

Trades Unions (Protection of Funds) Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Bruce, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 13 [Bill 216]
Bill read 2°, after short debate *July* 19, [198] 233
Committee* ; Report *July* 22
Read 3°* *July* 23
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Morley*) *July* 26 (No. 226)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 30, 992 ; Bill read 2ª, after short debate
Committee* ; Report *August* 2
Read 3ª* *August* 3
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 61]

Treasury Board, Constitution of the
Question, Mr. Sclater-Booth ; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *Feb* 19, [194] 124 ; Observations, Mr. Sclater-Booth ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer ; debate thereon *Mar* 8, 842

TRELAWNY, Sir J. G. S., *Cornwall, E.*
Sunday Trading, Comm. [195] 805

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Hawick, &c.*
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [195] 1701 ; Comm. [197] 561
Navy Estimates—New Works, [195] 212

TREVOR, Lord A. E. HILL- *Downshire*
Ireland—Cashel Election, [195] 976
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 155

TRURO, Lord
Army—Military Force of the Kingdom, [195] 1461

TUAM, Bishop of
*Irish Church, 2R. [197] 104 ; Comm. *cl.* 46, 1164 ; 3R. 1613 ; Commons Amendts. [198] 440

Turkey
British Subjects in the Levant, Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 4, [198] 1250
Christians in Crete, Question, Mr. Serjeant Dowse ; Answer, Mr. Otway *July* 16, [198] 19
Cretan Insurgents, Question, Mr. Monk ; Answer, Mr. Otway *April* 19, [195] 1099
Turco - Persian Boundary Line, Question, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe ; Answer, The Earl of Clarendon *May* 3, [196] 1

TURNOR, Mr. E., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Cattle Plague in Roumania, [197] 1081

Turnpike Acts Continuance
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Schedules of the annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1868, and report their opinion thereon" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *Mar* 17, [194] 1617
And, on *April* 2, Committee nominated as follows :—Lord George Cavendish (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Beach, Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Henniker-Major, and Mr. Welby
Report of Select Committee *June* 14
(*Parl. P.* No. 262)

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Secretary Bruce*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 1 [Bill 191]
Read 2°* *July* 8
Committee* Report *July* 22
Considered*; *July* 23
Read 3°* *July* 26
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Morley*) *July* 27 (No. 230)
Read 2ª* *July* 30
Committee* *August* 2
Report* *August* 3
Read 3°* *August* 5
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 90]

Turnpike Roads Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Mar* 16 [Bill 52]

Turnpike Trusts
Question, Mr. G. Clive ; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Mar* 2, [194] 483 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Bruce *May* 3, [196] 16 ; Observations, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Reply, Sir George Jenkinson *July* 23, [198] 619

[*cont.*

Turnpike Trusts—cont.
Repair of Bridges, Question, Sir Herbert Croft; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *July* 15, [197] 1886

United States
"*Alabama*" *Claims*, Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Otway *Feb* 25, [194] 309; Observations, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe; Reply, The Earl of Clarendon *June* 4, [196] 1227
Consulate at Chicago, Question, Mr. Bowring; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 5, [198] 1293
Hog Cholera, The, Question, Earl Cowper; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *April* 16, [195] 942
(See *Post Office*)
Murder of Captain Speer, Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Mr. Otway *June*, 10, [196] 1498
Recent Negotiations with the, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, Sir Henry Bulwer *July* 8, [197] 1425
San Juan, Island of, Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Otway *August* 4, [198] 1248

University Tests Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Grant Duff*)
194] *c.* Considered in Committee; after short debate a Resolution agreed to *Feb* 23, 272; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 15]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 10, 1041
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Mowbray*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Mar* 15, 1415; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); A. 75, N. 251; M. 176
Question again proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Raikes*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; after further short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
197] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 29, 767
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. 788
Committee; Report *July* 2, 1090
Considered* *July* 5
Read 3°* *July* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl Russell*) *July* 9 (No. 177)
198] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 19, 125; after short debate, a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put? Cont. 54, Not-Cont. 91; M. 37; Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 144

University Tests Bill and the House of Lords
Question, Mr. Sartoris; Answer, The Solicitor General; short debate thereon *July* 22, [198] 451
Durham University, Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, The Solicitor General *Mar* 22, [194] 1897

Vacating of Seats Bill
Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to repeal section twenty-six of the Act of the sixth year of Queen Anne, chapter seven, relating to the Re-election of Members accepting office under the Crown" (*Viscount Bury*) *Feb* 23, [194] 210; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Vaccination Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 29 (No. 85)
Bill withdrawn* *July* 15

Valuation of Property Bill—*Formerly* **Rateable Property Bill**
(*Mr. Goschen, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Goschen*) *Feb* 22, [194] 185; Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1°* [Bill 11]
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 18, 1660
Bill withdrawn* *July* 1

Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Bill *Formerly* **Rateable Property (Metropolis) Bill**
(*Mr. Goschen, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Goschen*) *Feb* 22, [194] 170; Bill ordered, after debate; read 1°* [Bill 12]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 1, [195] 17; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Goschen *April* 8, 359
Committee*; Report *April* 30
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 8, [197] 1482 [Bill 100]
Committee*; Report *July* 13
Considered* *July* 23
Read 3°* *July* 26
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 27
Read 2ª* *July* 29 (No. 229)
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª* *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 67]

VANCE, Mr. J., *Armagh City*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 1, [196] 841; *add. cl.* 857, 858
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Cashel Election, [195] 1935
Firearms, Use of, by the Irish Constabulary, [197] 1668
Hackney Carriages in Dublin, [195] 583
Portadown—Riots at, [197] 1171

[*cont.*

VANCE, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Prisons, [195] 1855
Rumoured Resignation of the Lord Lieutenant, [194] 2003
Ireland—Ulster, Recent Events in, Motion for Papers, [198] 356
194] Irish Church, 2R. 1964
195] Comm. *cl.* 12, 1112; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1409, 1410; *cl.* 25, 1606; *cl.* 26, 1627; *cl.* 29, Motion for reporting Progress, 1931
196] *cl.* 36, 71; *cl.* 58, 393; Consid. 756, 772; Amendt. 776
197] Lords Amendts. Amendt. 1963, 1964
198] 79, 573
Parliament—Dublin City Writ, [196] 1791, 1792; [197] 128
Parliament—Beverley Election, Motion for an Address, [195] 565
Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1559
Supply—Motion for reporting Progress, [197] 1482
Ways and Means—Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), [196] 806

Venus (1874), *Transit of*
Considered in Committee *August* 6, [198] 1394
Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the carrying out of the arrangements necessary for observing the Transit of Venus which will take place in the year 1874; and to assure Her Majesty that this House will make good any expense that may be incurred thereby"
Resolution reported *August* 7

VERNER, Mr. E. Wingfield, *Lisburn*
Dublin Freemen Commission, 2R. [197] 1176
Ireland—Anketell, Mr., Murder of, [194] 1091
Dublin, Lord Mayor of, [196] 746
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 910; *cl.* 12, 1118; *cl.* 15, 1403

VERNER, Mr. W., *Armagh Co.*
Ireland—Caledon—12th July in, [198] 448
Portadown—Riots at, [197] 1170
Irish Church, 2R. [194] 2043; Comm. *cl.* 26, [195] 1625

VERNEY, Sir H., *Buckingham*
Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [195] 27
British Columbia—Motion for Papers, [196] 1098
Canada—Dockyard Emigrants, [196] 105
Hudson's Bay Company, [194] 309; [197] 1526
Revenue Officers, 2R. [194] 1576
Supply—Consular Buildings, &c. [197] 1470
Learned Societies, [198] 504, 506

VILLIERS, Right Hon. C. P., *Wolverhampton*
Assessed Rates, Consid. Amendt. [197] 1088

VIVIAN, Hon. Captain J. C. W. (Lord of the Treasury), *Truro*
Army—Questions, &c.
Henry-Martini Rifle, [198] 1370, 1371
MacLoughlin, Dr., Case of, [198] 896
Mauritius—Troops in the, [196] 1591
Military Labour, [196] 1209
Relief of Regiments in India, [197] 1421
Volunteers, Ammunition for the, [196] 1591
Wimbledon Review, [198] 1493
Army—Clerks of the Works and Royal Engineers, Res. [197] 135
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1569
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1006
Ireland—Military Prison, Dublin, [198] 325
Militia, Comm. [195] 1419

VIVIAN, Mr. H. Hussey, *Glamorganshire*
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1562
Coal Fields, Motion for an Address, [196] 1911
Navy—North Country Coal, Use of, [195] 1354

Volunteer Act (1863) Amendment Bill
(*Captain Vivian, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 22 [Bill 236]
Read 2° * *July* 26
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Northbrook*) *August* 2 (No. 257)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict* c. 81]

WALKER, Major G. G., *Dumfriesshire*
Army—Militia and Reserve Forces, Motion for Returns, [195] 1759, 1763
Army of Reserve, Res. [196] 1465
Contagious Diseases (Animals) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 90, Amendt. [197] 1759; *cl.* 122, 1765
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 395
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 39, [196] 317
Militia, Comm. [195] 1418
Parochial Schools (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 820; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1124; *cl.* 24, 1239, 1384
Railway Signalling, [198] 1372

WALPOLE, Right Hon. S. H., *Cambridge University*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 6, [196] 1214; *cl.* 46, 1412, 1415, 1416
British Museum—Temple Collection, [195] 1579
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [194] 189, 412
Financial Statement, [195] 584
Imprisonment for Debt, Consid. *cl.* 5, [197] 764
194] Irish Church, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1994, 2004
195] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1015; *cl.* 10, 1108; *cl.* 12, 1110; *cl.* 14, 1371, 1372; *cl.* 17, 1411, 1412; *cl.* 20, 1503; *cl.* 27, 1634
197] Lords Amendts. 1958, 1961
198] 92, 98
Newspapers, &c. Comm. [195] 1417
O'Sullivan's Disability, Leave, [196] 199

[*cont.*

Walpole, Right Hon. S. H.—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, [194] 1093
Parliament — Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 192
Speaker, Election of a, [194] 6
Supply—British Museum, [198] 219
University Tests, 2R. [194] 1457; Comm. [197] 782

Walpole, Hon. F., *Norfolk, N.*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1437

Walsh, Hon. A., *Radnorshire*
Army—Royal Horse Artillery, [197] 359
Inclosure of Commons, [195] 976
Post Office—Services in Wales, [196] 1295

Walter, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
Assessed Rates, Consid. [197] 1089
Convict Richard Bonner, [194] 162
Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 575
Endowed Schools, Leave, [194] 120; 2R. 1402; Comm. *cl.* 9, [196] 1745; *cl.* 15, 1767; *cl.* 29, 1775; *cl.* 41, 1781
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 14, [195] 1151; *cl.* 18, 1475, 1484; *cl.* 32, [196] 23; Lords Amendts. [197] 1981; [198] 29
Law Courts, New, Motion for a Committee, [197] 463
Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 555
Parliament — House of Commons' Arrangements, Res. [195] 299
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [196] 664
Real Estate Intestacy, Leave, [194] 963
Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1936
Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 3, [198] 763; *cl.* 4, 768
University Tests, Comm. *cl.* 6, [197] 791; *add. cl.* 1096, 1103

Warehousing of Wines and Spirits, &c. Bill

(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 201]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee *; Report *August* 3
Considered * *August* 4
Read 3° * *August* 4
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 5 (No. 272)
Read 2ª* *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 103]

Water Supply Bill

(*Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Goldney, Colonel Napier Sturt, Marquess of Lorne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 83]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 27

WAYS AND MEANS

195] Considered in Committee *April* 8, 363—Financial Statement of The Chancellor of the Exchequer on moving the First Resolution, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Duty of Customs now charged on Tea shall continue to be levied and charged on and after the 1st day of August 1869 until the 1st day of August 1870, on the importation thereof into Great Britain and Ireland: viz.—Tea . . . the lb. 0*s.* 6*d.*;" after long debate, Motion agreed to
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered *April* 9, 566
Considered in Committee *April* 12, 585
Moved, "That the Duties of Customs chargeable upon the articles under-mentioned, imported into Great Britain and Ireland, shall cease and determine, viz.:—Corn, Grain, Meal, and Flour, and articles of the like character, viz.:—
[Then the articles are set forth.]
After debate, Resolution withdrawn; other Resolutions agreed to; Resolutions reported *April* 13
Customs and Excise Duties — Considered in Committee *May* 13, [196] 780
Re-committed Resolutions—1. (Beer and Ale, on importation into Great Britain and Ireland) — 2. (Male Servants, Carriages, or Horses or Mules, or Armorial Bearings, and Horsedealers), agreed to
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 8
Considered in Committee *July* 30, [198] 1054

Questions thereon

Assessed Taxes, Question, Mr. Barnett; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *April* 9, [195] 478
Cabs and Omnibuses, Licenses on, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 11, [198] 1541
Corn, The Duty on, Question, Mr. Macfie; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 9, [195] 479; Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, 584; Question, Mr. A. Johnston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, 844
Excise Licence on Horses, Question, Sir Henry Hoare; Answer, Mr. Scourfield *April* 19, [195] 1097
Fire Insurance Policies—Rebate or Drawback, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 11, [196] 574
Income Tax, Question, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart; Answer, Mr. Stansfeld *June* 4, [196] 1238
Income and Assessed Taxes, Payment of, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, [197] 122
Malt Duty, Question, Mr. M'Combie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, [194] 625; Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 4, [198] 1247
Payment of Income Tax, &c., Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, [195] 584; Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, 843
Stamp Duties Exemptions, Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 29, [195] 1849

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—cont.
Taxes on Servants, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 29, [195] 1849; Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 1, [196] 1097
Tax on Shepherds' Dogs, Question, Mr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 1, [197] 947

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

SCHEDULE OF WAYS AND MEANS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 5 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION ACT—VIZ.:

	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 1. s. 1. for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1868 and 1869	4,506,272	13	4
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1870—viz.:			
Per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 1 s. 2	3,900,000	0	0
Per Act 32 *Vict.* c. 8 ...	17,100,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	21,746,684	2	3
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	798,132	17	9
TOTAL GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS to meet the following Supplies:— 1868-9 £4,506,272 13 4 1869-70 43,544,817 0 0	£48,051,089	13	4

WEDDERBURN, Sir D., *Ayrshire, S.*
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 1, [198] 1013
Game Laws (Scotland), Motion for a Committee, [195] 1730
Game Laws (Scotland) [Mr. M'Lagan], 2R. [197] 504
Game Laws (Scotland) (No. 2), 2R. [198] 881
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [198] 386
India—Barracks at Morar, [197] 1418
India — East India Revenue Accounts, Res. [198] 1357
Scotland—Truck System, [197] 1885

WEGUELIN, Mr. C., *Youghal*
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Instruction to Committee, [194] 1508

Weights and Measures (*False*) *and Adulteration*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 5, To leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that Her Majesty's Government should give their earliest attention to the widespread and most reprehensible practices of using False Weights and Measures and of adulterating Food, Drink, and Drugs, with the view of amending the Law as regards the penalties now inflicted for those offences, and of providing more efficient means for the discovery and prevention of fraud" (*Lord Eustace Cecil*),
[*cont.*

Weights and Measures (*False*) *and Adulteration*—cont.
[194] 718; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Weights and Measures, Metric System
Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Mr. Bright *April* 16, [195] 972

WELBY, Mr. W. E., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 18, [196] 850
Feed Stuffs and Manures, Res. [197] 969
*Seeds Adulteration, 2R. [196] 1916, 1938
Ways and Means, Res. 2. (Customs and Excise Duties), Amendt. [196] 806

WELLS, Mr. W., *Peterborough*
Post Office—Life Assurances, [194] 1188
Savings Banks, [196] 101

West Indies
Question, Sir Charles Adderley; Answer, Mr. Monsell *July* 15, [197] 1889
Clergy in the, Question, Mr. Crum-Ewing; Answer, Mr. Monsell *Mar* 23, [194] 2001

WEST, Mr. H. W., *Ipswich*
Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 54, [196] 1593, 1596; *cl.* 88, 1606; *cl.* 126, 1901; *cl.* 130, [197] 314, 324, 327; *cl.* 131, 416
Court of Common Pleas (County Palatine of Lancaster), 2R. [194] 774; Comm. [195] 218
Imprisonment for Debt, 2R. [195] 178; Comm. *cl.* 4, [197] 424; *cl.* 5, 577; *cl.* 18, 581
Revising Barristers, Appointment of, [198] 1541

WESTBURY, Lord
Bankruptcy, [194] 103; Comm. [198] 17
Common Law Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [194] 1459
Ecclesiastical Courts, &c., Nomination of Committee, [195] 1352
Fine Arts Copyright and Consolidation Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [195] 1936, 1942
Ireland—Dublin City Election, Address, [196] 1398
Irish Church, 2R. [197] 229; Comm. Preamble, 732; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 755, 758; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 759; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 874, 880; 3R. 1648
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [195] 1187; Comm. 1549

WESTMEATH, Marquess of
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, [195] 1534
State of, [195] 1971; [196] 732
Tenure (Ireland), Comm. [195] 1554

WHALLEY, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1328
Income Tax, Res. [194] 1530, 1534
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 894; *cl.* 2, 1037; *cl.* 12, 1118; *cl.* 18, 1488; *cl.* 25, 1616; *cl.* 37, [196] 73; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 107, 117, 130, 138, 139, 317, 318; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 406, 407; Lords Amendts. [197] 1984; [198] 86, 578
Local Taxation, Motion for an Address, [194] 249
[*cont.*

Whalley, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*
  Murphy, Mr., Arrest of, Res. [198] 611, 613, 621
  New Zealand—Affairs of, [198] 492
  O'Farrell Papers, The, [195] 1757
  Party Processions (Ireland), 2R. [194] 1559
  Pharmacy Act Amendment, Comm. [195] 1934
  Poor Law—Removal of Children, Res. [197] 1341
  Supply—Education, Public, [198] 170
    Home Office, &c. Departments, [197] 1481
    House of Commons Offices, [197] 1477
  Trades Unions (Protection of Funds), 2R. [198] 233
  Turnpike Trusts, [196] 16

Whatman, Mr. J., *Maidstone*
  Army—West Kent Militia, [195] 678

Wheelhouse, Mr. W. St. John, *Leeds*
  Army — Camping System, Major M'Gwire's, Motion for Papers, [198] 725
  Courts of Justice, New, Res. [195] 1245
  Evidence Amendment, 2R. [195] 1807
  French Treaty, Motion for a Committee, [197] 338
  Hospitals, &c. Rating Exemption, 2R. [195] 1814
  Poor Rates, Exemption from, [194] 356
  Printworks Regulation, Res. [194] 1538
  Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 400
  Supply—Education, Public, [198] 196

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
  Army Estimates—Buildings and Repairs, [195] 669
  Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 130, [197] 320, 328
  Dublin Freemen, Leave, [197] 959
  Endowed Schools, 2R. [194] 1398; Comm. *cl.* 10, [196] 1750; *cl.* (A.) 12, 1764
  Metropolitan Street Tramways, 2R. [194] 554
  Parliament — Dublin City Writ, [196] 1793; [197] 133

White, Hon. Captain C. W., *Tipperary Co.*
  Metropolis — Hyde Park, Furious Riding in, [197] 1591

White, Mr. J., *Brighton*
  Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 631, 639, 645
  Army—War Office and Horse Guards, [194] 625; Res. 1094, 1111
  Assessed Rates, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [197] 390
  Audit of Public Accounts, [197] 630
  Civil Offices (Pensions), Consid. [197] 541
  Coronation Oath, The, [198] 893
  Diplomatic Service, Expenses of the, [194] 836
  Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866, [197] 1194
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [198] 1007
  Navy—Lord High Admiral, Office of, [194] 627
    Official Salaries, [195] 27
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [194] 73
  Real Property, Res. [196] 596
  Société Agricole et Industrielle d'Egypte, [198] 451

White, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [194] 645
    House of Lords Offices, [197] 1474
    Houses of Parliament, [197] 680; Amendt. 683; Report, 1435
  Telegraph, Comm. [198] 754
  Vacating of Seats, Leave, [194] 210

Whitwell, Mr. J., *Kendal*
  Bankruptcy, Comm. *cl.* 4, [196] 1212; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1225; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1416; *cl.* 54, 1593
  Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1318, 1321
  Clerks in the Customs, [198] 1525
  Supply — Embassies and Missions Abroad, [198] 944
    Miscellaneous Expenses, [198] 974
    Public Offices Site, [197] 1208
    Public Works (Ireland) (Salaries), [198] 515
    Superannuations, [198] 962
    Temporary Commissions, [198] 966
  Telegraph, Comm. *cl.* 4, [198] 768

Whitworth, Mr. T., *Drogheda*
  Supply—Learned Societies, [198] 506

Williams, Mr. W., *Denbigh, &c.*
  County Courts, 2R. [194] 1565
  Election Expenses, 2R. [194] 578
  Libel, 2R. [194] 1615
  Merchant Shipping and Navigation, Leave, [198] 1514
  Parliament—Dumfriesshire Election, Motion for a Committee, [194] 191
  Thames Embankment and the Metropolitan Railway Company, [198] 1528

Williamson, Sir H., *Durham, N.*
  Light Dues, Res. [196] 183

Willyams, Mr. E. W. Brydges, *Cornwall, E.*
  Parliamentary, &c. Elections — Nomination Days, [194] 952

Wilmot, Colonel H., *Derbyshire, S.*
  Army—Adjutancies of Militia, Res. [197] 139

Wiltes Peerage
l. Report from the Committee for Privileges that the Petitioner had not made out his claim considered; Moved, that the said Report be agreed to *May* 10, [196] 426
  Amendt. to leave out from ("That,") and insert ("the Petition of the claimant to the dignity of Earl of Wiltes be referred back to the Committee for Privileges in order that the same be re-heard") (*The Duke of Cleveland*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to; Resolved and adjudged, That the Petitioner hath not made out his claim, 428 (*Parl. P. l.* No. 100)

Winchilsea, Earl of
  Furious Riding, Conviction for, [197] 1105
  Irish Church, Commons Amendts. [198] 320
  National Gallery, Purchases for the, [198] 652
    Res. [198] 1140

Wine Duties—Reduction of
Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Mr. Ayrton *July* 6, [197] 1270

WINGFIELD, Sir C. J., *Gravesend*
Abyssinian War, Motion for a Committee, [196] 1434
Central Asia, [197] 1561
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [198] 1363; *cl.* 2, 1365, 1366; *cl.* 6, 1367
Governor General of India, Comm. [198] 1368
Gravesend County Court, [195] 1579
India—Appeals, [197] 1423
Punjaub Tenancy Act, [194] 1085; [196] 748
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [198] 1190
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [194] 926

WINTERBOTHAM, Mr. H. S. P., *Stroud*
*Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* (A) 12, Amendt. [196] 1752, 1765
Portugal—Cassells, Mr., Case of, [194] 125, 127
Supply—Colonies, Grants in Aid, [198] 958
University Tests, Comm. *add. cl.* [197] 1103

Wisley Common
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the proposed Inclosure of Wisley Common" (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*) *April* 2, [195] 125; after short debate, A. 43, N. 22; M. 21
And, on *April* 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Francis Goldsmid (Chairman), Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Frederick Stanley, and Mr. Brown Westhead
Report of Select Committee *April* 26 (*Parl. P.* No. 169)

Witnesses (House of Commons) Bill
(*Sir John Esmonde, Mr. Bonham-Carter*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 13 [Bill 129]
Read 2°* *June* 22
Bill withdrawn * *July* 20

WYLLIE, Mr. J. W. S., *Hereford City*
India—Kohat, Garrison of, [194] 488

WYNDHAM, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
Irish Church, Comm. [195] 890; *cl.* 23, 1530; *cl.* 39, [196] 135, 138, 309
Sunday and Ragged Schools, 2R. Amendt. [196] 1969

WYNN, Sir W. W., *Denbighshire*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1321

WYNN, Mr. C. W. W., *Montgomeryshire*
Elections (Wales), Res. [197] 1323

YORK, Archbishop of
Bishops Resignation, 2R. [197] 1742
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations, 2R. [195] 1818, 1820
Endowed Schools, Comm. *cl.* 14, [197] 1878
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [195] 1338, 1340
Irish Church, Comm. *cl.* 23, [197] 929; Report, 1488
New Parishes, &c. 2R. [196] 1582, 1583
Sea Birds Preservation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [196] 78

Yorkshire and Lancashire, Shrievalties of
Question, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 1, [194] 411

Youghal New Writ
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Burgess to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Youghal, in the room of Christopher Weguelin, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Glyn*) *April* 30, [195] 2068
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the issuing of a new Writ for Youghal be postponed until the Minutes of Evidence taken on the Election Petition be printed" (*Mr. Collins*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 102, N. 70; M. 32; main Qestion put, and agreed to

YOUNG, Mr. A. W., *Helston*
Bishops Resignation, Comm. *cl.* 2, [198] 1319
Imperial Gas, Consid. [195] 1790
Special and Common Juries, 2R. [198] 400

YOUNG, Mr. G. (Solicitor General for Scotland), *Wigton, &c.*
Habitual Criminals, Comm. *cl.* 13, [198] 1281
Parliament—Bewdley Writ, [194] 667
Parochial Schools (Scotland), 2R. [197] 1735; Comm. *cl.* 59, [198] 1444
Post Office—Communication with Australia, [195] 140

Zanzibar (Jurisdiction of Consul) Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered* *July* 20
Read 1°* *July* 22 [Bill 237]
Read 2°* *July* 26
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3°* *July* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *August* 2 (No. 246)
Read 2ª* *August* 3
Committee*; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 9 [32 & 33 *Vict.* c. 75]

ERRATA.

In Volume [194] p. 377, line 4 from bottom, *for* Mr. C. Wykeham Martin, *read* Mr. P. Wykeham Martin.
In Volume [195] p. 788, line 4, *for* Mr. C. O. Morgan *read* Mr. G. O. Morgan.
In Volume [197] p. 1818, line 20, *for* Mr. Layard *read* Mr. Laird.

END OF VOLUME CXCVIII., AND FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF SESSION 1868-9.

UL 30 SEP 1963